THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1938. Vol. XXVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Opposition to the Freethinkers' Congress.

The proposal of the authorities of the International Congress of the World Union of Freethinkers to hold their Congress in London in September next has aroused considerable opposition in religious circles, and petitions against it have been organized.

Sir Samuel Hoare as Home Secretary, replying to these representations against holding the Congress, has rightly pointed out that such a Congress is not contrary to the law of the land. Yet at the same time he personally 'deplored' the holding of such a Congress. To this expression of official opinion, Mr. Ernest Thurtle (Mr. Lansbury's son-in-law) replied in a letter to the *Times* of June 15th asserting that such a Congress could not be used for political purposes as it would be contrary to the standing orders of the Congress itself. It was therefore no subtle effort to promote Communism in this country. Mr. Thurtle also stated that

> 'This desire to prevent those who differ from them from subjecting religious doctrines to the analysis of reason does not, one hopes, represent the view of the enlightened members of those religious organizations.'

The issue raised, like so many of the issues 'which touch our ease,' is a mixed one. Some who are altogether in favour of the use of reason in the sphere of religion are not in favour of the public raising of acute religious controversy, nor are they in favour of the dissemination of the startling utterances of anti-religious propagandists in the popular press.

On the other hand Christians who claim rightly that the spirit of truth and the spirit of freedom combined with the spirit of love are the very essence of the religion of Christ, have to exercise extraordinary care that they do not place their religion in an attitude of opposition to the free exercise of reason. This is the more needful to-day because in her long history and in so many countries, *e.g.* Russia, Italy and Spain, the Christian Church has again and again shewn herself the enemy of both freedom and truth.

If the Bolshevik and his anti-God comrades have as their motto : Religion is the opiate of the people, they have had much experience to justify their conclusion. Too often religion has been not only on the side of intellectual and moral stagnation, but it has also been on the side of ecclesiastical and political oppression.

What Christian England needs when faced with such a dilemma as that which the Congress of Freethinkers presents is to grant the freedom claimed by the Freethinkers with the request that as a responsible and rational being he will not permit liberty to degenerate into license. All the better organs in the British Press can be trusted to report such proceedings with discretion and a due sense of public welfare.

Although Freethinker is often a synonym for atheist, there are many cases in which this is not so. Many Freethinkers are ethical theists, as for instance was Thomas Paine, popularly called Tom Pain, the Atheist. Those who have read his *Age of Reason* know that he was no more an atheist than was Voltaire, who built a Church for the worship of God.

We cannot sufficiently stress the urgent import of this occasion. If the Christian Church in this land would concern herself with demanding the acceptance of only the great simplicities of the Christian religion as needful for membership and office in

her communion and would purge her teaching and public worship from obscurantist and superstitious elements — 'that ancient good' which an increasing knowledge of the truth has rendered 'uncouth' — she would have nothing serious to fear even from anti-God Congresses.

The Church has been slow to recognize, and is even now far from recognizing, that the serious and conscientious Freethinker ought to have his place within her Communion and that she ought so to enlarge her sympathy in the spirit of Christ as to provide a spiritual home for such an one. A vast multitude of Freethinkers in this land are outside the English Church, who if she were more true to her Lord and His Spirit would be inside the Church and would constitute within her a most valuable element.

It seems to us that Charles Kingsley's Letter to an Atheist (published in *Letters and Memories of his Life*, Vol. ii, p. 90) transmits the spirit which a Christian Englishman should adopt towards Freethinking propaganda.

Where the Freethinker is keen upon detecting, confuting and abolishing religious error and falsehood we are with him heart and soul, for in doing this he is the true friend of religion and humanity. Where however he is bent upon destroying religion, and especially the Christian religion, he is engaged in the futile and detrimental operation of throwing out the babe with the bath water; and in the name of truth and humanity we must oppose him.

We Christian Modernists, like the greatest of the Cambridge Platonists, refuse to 'oppose rational to spiritual,' holding that on the highest level 'that which is spiritual is most truly rational.'

Bible Celebrations and Biblical Problems.

The commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the placing of the English Bible in every Parish Church so that the laity could have access to it and read it, will, it is to be hoped, concentrate the attention of many upon the right use of this increasingly neglected religious classic.

Whilst from primitive times the Christian Church has placed the highest value on the Bible of which she has been the custodian, she has had to face a series of problems in connection with it. The first of these problems concerned the Canon of Scripture : what books should be admitted into it and what books excluded from it. Marcion, 'the most Christian of heretics' as Harnack called him, desired to exclude the whole of the Old Testament and would have been satisfied to have his New Testament consist of one Gospel (*Luke*) and ten Pauline epistles. It would be interesting to speculate as to how the Church would have fared with so small a Bible. Certainly, she would have got rid of what Thomas Carlyle called 'the Hebrew old clothes,' but she would have suffered immeasurable loss in the richness and variety of her sacred literature.

The second set of problems which faced the Church was concerned with the interpretation of Scripture. Dean Farrar's interesting and in some cases amusing Bampton Lectures (too little known to Englishmen to-day) indicate how many and how ingenious these methods of scriptural interpretation were.

The third set of problems has been concerned with the Higher Criticism of the Scriptures, which, although it occasionally raised its head in ancient times, strode menacingly into the field in the early eighteenth century and has occupied in increasing measure the attention of the scholars of the Church. Although the work of Higher Criticism is undoubtedly nearing completion, it is not easy yet to estimate justly its results. That they will be serious, if not revolutionary, is evident. Ultimately it must lead to the re-casting of many Christian dogmas. Certainly it has destroyed for ever among educated Christians belief in the verbal infallibility of the Scriptures. Less than a century ago Dean Burgon could write :

> 'The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that "sitteth upon the Throne." Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more and some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.'

Such a declaration if made by a University preacher to-day would suggest mental derangement.

But where belief in the infallibility of Scripture has been abandoned it has been impossible to secure that popular reverence for the Bible which it formerly commanded. The modern Christian teacher may say: although this book is not infallible, yet it is inspired: although it is not the Word of God yet it contains the Word of God: although it does not provide a solution for all our modern moral and spiritual problems inasmuch as many of these problems had not been visualized in the periods when the Bible was written; yet the basic truths which the Bible enshrines are still essential and valid for the good life. Nevertheless our British public has not found it easy to grasp these distinctions and to make without loss the transition from the old view of the Bible to the new.

In order that this transition should be profitably effected (and it must be effected if the nation is not to cease to be Christian) a vast deal of Biblical education has to take place. For this Biblical education we have at present no sufficient supply of competent teachers, nor any adequate realization by the nation of the necessity for them, nor the recognition of the need for providing sufficient space in our school time-tables for Scriptural education.

The English Bible ought to be an essential constituent of our English education and the chief factor in our national culture. But this can only be secured if our religious authorities are united with our educational authorities in requiring that Biblical teaching in the schools shall be as fearless as it is thorough. Such a policy we know would have secured the whole-hearted support of the great Huxley, and there must be many Agnostics and Freethinkers in our midst to-day who would support our educational authorities in implementing such a policy.

'Silent while Thinking.'

Under the heading 'Silent while Thinking,' which reminds us of the Victorian verse—

> Achilles ponders in his tent,
> The Kings of modern thought are dumb,
> Silent they are but not content,
> They wait to see the future come,
> Silent while thoughts engrave the brow,
> Silent, the best are silent now—

the *Times* of June 15th summarizes as follows the concluding portion of Dr. Pollock's address to the Norwich Diocesan Conference:

> 'It was for the whole Church, and not for the individual, to decide what her own formularies meant, and until she had altered her view a priest, as her ordained minister, was bound by her requirements. The constituted authorities of the Church could scarcely be considered prejudiced or blind or harsh if they expected the commissioned teacher of the Church publicly to teach the truth as she held it and not as he had revised it for himself. He did not for a moment advocate trials for heresy. In these days they rather turned to common-sense, public opinion, and to honourable and chivalrous feeling. On the one hand, it would be a mistake to pounce upon the first possible indication of doubt in a clergyman's own mind, privately entertained, and to allow him no space for reflection to gain or regain a grasp of the truth. While he was thinking, let him be silent. On the other hand, a clergyman was not within his rights if from his authoritative position in the Catholic Church he unhesitatingly advocated something contrary to her doctrine.'

An utterance of this kind seems to us to raise more questions than it answers. In the history of the Christian Church is it not the individual Christian teachers rather than the Church's constitutional Assemblies who have done the Church's thinking for her? Were not a number of these thinkers, for instance Athanasius, Peter Abelard, Thomas Aquinas, Erasmus, teaching a form of Christian Truth which was regarded as novel by their contemporaries and certainly as not contained in the Church's formularies as she had received them from the past? Would not the Christian Church have suffered incalculable loss if these great teachers had felt it their duty to remain silent until the Church Councils or supreme Pontiffs had decided what was to be taught in the changed situation of their age? Was it not the utterances of these teachers which in a number of cases assisted the Church authorities to more adequate formulations of Church doctrine? Could the Church have come to what are now regarded as right decisions if these great teachers had remained 'silent while thinking'?

There is no difficulty in remaining silent while thinking: the problem is how to remain silent while teaching. The clergyman's post in the Church of England is pre-eminently a teaching post—with us the ministry of the Word takes precedence of the ministry of the Sacraments. To-day we recognize that the

teaching Church must be also the learning Church, and this is true of each of her ministers. This conception seems to demand an entirely different relationship to his office from that which underlies Dr. Pollock's pronouncement. The primary relationship of the clergyman as teacher is not to a set of formularies, but to Jesus Christ Himself and His Spirit, Who is ever seeking to guide the faithful disciple into all truth. The Christian relationship of teacher to taught may on occasion be that of the prophet speaking with the authority of Divine Inspiration to those who are ignorant and rebellious, but normally his relationship to those whom he teaches ought to be that of a learner co-operating with fellow-learners in their search after a growing understanding of the truth. We are convinced that it is the recognition of this double relationship which contributes most effectively to influential Christian teaching and provides the best safeguard against rash denials and irresponsible utterances.

Underlying Dr. Pollock's address to his Conference we seem to have the assumption that the conclusions of Christian scholars are all prescribed by the Church. If this be so, development of Christian doctrine is impossible, and the age-long guidance of the Spirit into all truth, an illusion. Another underlying assumption of the Bishop's utterance appears to be that every clergyman's doubts in the matter of Church doctrine must be wrong. The history of Christian doctrine indicates that there are many cases where doubt as to the truth of some accepted Church doctrine has led the doubter, not into error but into a fuller knowledge of the truth, and not only the doubter but through him, the Christian Church also. For the modern Christian at any rate, doubt is not a sinful condition, although it may be an uncomfortable one. And if loyally faced and not suppressed, it may lead into fresh domains of truth not yet discovered by traditionalists.

No responsible Christian teacher wishes to encourage irresponsible utterance in public, but there is less danger to the truth and detriment to the Church in such utterance than in suppression. Nothing probably could do more to undermine the moral and spiritual authority of the Church than the conviction among the laity that there is a conspiracy of silence

among the clergy. We believe that the modern practice of thinking aloud has proved one of the best methods by which teacher and taught advance together into a further knowledge of the truth.

We cannot but wonder whether Dr. Pollock realizes what may be the effect of such well-meant warnings as his on open-minded young men trained in the atmosphere of science and research who have been thinking of the Christian ministry as a possible sphere for their life's work. Science encourages the spirit of doubt and it also encourages freedom of speech. It also encourages the acceptance of truth, not as something fixed and rigid but as a series of working hypotheses to be proved, or it may be, disproved, and modified, as the outcome of further research and experience. Is it not advisable, if the Church is to secure influential teachers to-day, that she should grant and declare that she grants, to young men seeking to enter her ministry the same freedom in relationship to the truth which a young man knows he will receive if he becomes a teacher in the world of science?

A More Excellent Way.

It is a matter for sincere congratulation that the Church Assembly at its June Session decided by substantial majorities to withdraw the 'Cure of Souls Measure' and the 'Incumbents (Misbehaviour and Negligence) Measure' from further consideration by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament.

We stressed at the time of their first publication the objectionable features of these Measures and are profoundly thankful that the Church Assembly has been persuaded to drop them. Lord Hugh Cecil characteristically scolded the Archbishop of York for leading the retreat. Such sage reflections as are voiced in the motto 'Second thoughts are best thoughts,' and in Cardinal Newman's aphorism 'To live is to change and to be perfect is to have changed often,' carry no weight with Lord Hugh Cecil.

The Church Assembly, although warned that the Government would feel bound in loyalty to the Royal Prerogative to oppose the *Praemunire* Abolition Measure, decided to go forward with it. Provided our Church authorities, should this

measure be rejected by Parliament, do not allow the feeling of ecclesiastical disappointment to develop into a Church Disestablishment agitation on a large scale, we can see no convincing objection to their decision. The threat to enforce the *Praemunire* penalties against highly-placed ecclesiastics who feel conscientiously bound to oppose the appointment to a bishopric of a royal nominee, is an offence to modern feeling. In such a case the *Praemunire* is a dead letter to-day, and there is no British government, except perhaps a Communist one, which would dream of enforcing the penalties of that Tudor Statute against a recalcitrant Dean and Chapter.

If the reasons for the ecclesiastical objection to a royal nominee are frivolous and prejudiced, and as a consequence gravely unjust to the clergyman nominated to the vacant bishopric, the Crown can always proceed to appoint him by Royal Letters Patent. Should Parliament, as we hope it may, notwithstanding the warnings of the Government, pass the proposed *Praemunire* Abolition Measure, it must not be supposed that it will be any more than a 'sop to Cerberus' so far as Lord Hugh Cecil and a number of the more extreme Anglo-Catholic clergy are concerned. Lord Hugh Cecil seeks for the freedom (an impossible freedom) of the Church from the State without accompanying Disestablishment. Many of Lord Hugh Cecil's Anglo-Catholic allies in this warfare are intent upon Disestablishment in order to facilitate the submission of the Church of England to the Papacy. Lord Hugh Cecil and the other members of the Cecilian group are very unequally yoked with our pro-Papalists.

The voting of the House of Laymen in the recent session of the Church Assembly would be disconcerting if that House were really representative of the English laity. What such voting indicates is the urgent need for a more representative method of appointment to the House of Laymen. The need for such reform was pressed upon the attention of the Archbishops' Commission on Church and State, but as yet the Church authorities have taken no steps to reform a method of representation which in its results is really something of a scandal.

THE BIBLE AS LITERATURE*

By R. E. C. Houghton, M.A., Senior Tutor of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford.

WHATEVER else it may be, the Bible *is* literature. It is 'itself a literature'—a collection of books of high, though unequal, literary merit; just as a complete Shakespeare, the only volume that might be ranked above it as literature, contains plays of very unequal quality. The Bible is not absolutely different in kind from other books, only more intensely spiritual, more constantly concerned with the relations of God and man. Its uniqueness is for Christians only, and depends not on its literary qualities but on its containing the sole record of the earthly life of Jesus Christ. The difference between its various parts is more conspicuous in content than in form. The *Song of Songs* is good poetry but far less spiritual than Dante; while *Ecclesiastes*, spiritually below (say) the *Phaedo*, contains the ever memorable 'Remember now thy Creator,' etc. In considering the Bible as literature I am bound to limit myself (1) to its form, thus setting up what is ultimately a false dichotomy, and (2) to the *English* Bible. The latter limitation we need not regret, since no Hebrew scholar, so far as I am aware, claims that the Hebrew Old Testament is greater as literature than the Authorised Version. Hebrew poetry has been called 'the rhyme of thought,' and thought is more nearly reproduceable in translation than metre or rhyme. In fact there is nothing to prevent the translation being greater literature than the original. Tyndale considered that 'the properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than with the Latin,' and the Hebraisms which he and his successors introduced into their translations have long ceased to sound strange to an English ear.

Translation of the Bible has taken a large part in the history of English literature, particularly in earlier times. The task occupied Bede, Aelfric, and perhaps Alfred, among others, but the influence of Old English versions on later ones was only indirect. After the Norman conquest there was little literature in

* A paper read to the Oxford branch of the A.E.G.M. in May 1938.

English for two hundred years, and the chief prose of the fourteenth century was religious. Best known is the translation of the Bible by Wyclif and his followers. As prose the Wycliffite Bible is superior to any *secular* prose of its date, *e.g.* Mandeville. But it is inferior to the best poetry of the time because Chaucer was a genius and the translators were not. And Chaucer can even translate the Bible more idiomatically than his contemporaries. In the Second Nun's Tale (lines 384-5) we read :

> 'Caste all away the workës of darkness
> And armeth you in armour of brightness,'

whereas even the second Wycliffite version has 'Therefore cast we away the workis of darkness*is* and be we clothed in the armer*is* of light,' preserving the Latin plurals. You will already have noticed a familiar phrase, 'the works of darkness,' and I want to stress at once the fact that our English Bible is a gradual growth. The Authorised Version is not an original work but a composite one, an amalgamation and revision of the work of previous translators. A generation before Chaucer and Wyclif, Richard Rolle, the mystic and devotional writer, translated the Psalter, and some phrases are familiar, *e.g.* 'The earth is the Lordis and the fulness of it; the world and all that wones [*i.e* dwells] therein'; and, from the Gospels, 'many are called and few are chosen.'

Such phrases must have lived *per ora virûm*, and the Jacobean committee came to their task as men familiar with the work of some or all of their predecessors. The direct connection of the Wycliffite Bible with Tyndale and later versions is denied by Westcott, who would attribute any resemblance to common use of the Vulgate, but when we find a phrase like 'a well of water springing up into everlasting life' in both versions, and know that over 150 MSS. of the Wycliffite version still survive, we must, I think, suppose that Tyndale and others had heard, if not read, parts of it.

From Tyndale onwards the succession is not in doubt. In their Preface to the Authorised Version the revisers say :

> 'Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation nor yet to make of a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against,'

and (earlier)

> 'whatsoever is sound already . . . the same will shine as gold more brightly being rubbed and polished.'

The proximate cause of the Authorised Version was the rivalry between the Genevan Bible with its handy *format* on the one hand, and the Great Bible and the Bishop's Bible on the other, but each of these rested on the earlier work of Coverdale (1535), which in its turn derived from Tyndale for the New Testament and about half the Old Testament. It is not too much to say that our Authorised Version is substantially Tyndale where his translation exists. It has been calculated that ninety per cent. of the Authorised Version of the New Testament is his language. Those who are unfamiliar with the extent of this debt may compare the two passages that follow with the Authorised Version of *Ephesians* ii, 17-22, and *Numbers* xvi, 28-33[1]:

> 'And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh; for through him we both have an *open way* in one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but *citizens* with the saints and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the *head* corner-stone. *To* whom every building *coupled* together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom *ye* also are built together, *and made* an habitation for God *in* the Spirit.'

> 'And Moses said: Hereby *ye shall* know that the Lord hath sent me to do all these works, *and that* I have not done them of mine own mind. If these men die the common death of all men, or if they be visited after the visitation of all men, then the Lord hath not sent me. But, *and* if the Lord make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them, *and* all that *pertain* unto them, *so that* they go down quick into *hell,* then ye shall understand that these men have *railed upon* the Lord. And *as soon* as he had made an end of speaking all these words, the ground *clove* asunder that was under them, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them, and their houses, and all the men that *were with* Corah and all their goods. *And* they and all that pertained *un*to them, went down alive *un*to *hell,* and the earth closed upon them, and they perished from among the congregation.'

Tyndale was both the author of the first printed translation, and the first to go to the Hebrew and the Greek instead of the Vulgate, and 'His influence decided that our Bible should be popular and not literary . . . that so by its simplicity it should be endowed with permanence' (Westcott).

[1] Words in italics are not preserved in the Authorised Version. Tyndale's spelling has been modernized by Westcott.

It is perhaps because the Authorised Version owes so much to its predecessors that it is not too noticeably the work of its own epoch. It was not of an age and therefore it *is* for all time.

What was the importance of the translations of the Bible which culminated in the Authorised Version for the history of English literature? To my mind it was above all this — to provide a great body of English prose in which the thought was more important than the form, in which the translators were bound by reverence as well as good sense to render their original sincerely and earnestly, with simplicity and dignity, not 'hunting the letter' but striving to give all their fellow-countrymen the power to read for themselves what they believed to be the word of God. (So Purvey in the Prologue to the second Wycliffite version had said that 'The best translating is to translate after the sentence [*i.e.* meaning] and not only after the words,' and his motive was 'to save all men in our realm that God will have saved.')

It was extraordinarily difficult for Elizabethan prose writers to appreciate the difference between prose and poetry — to say what they had to say simply and without drawing undue attention to the form. Malory had written simply, if somewhat naïvely, at the end of the fifteenth century, but after the full tide of Renaissance reached England writers were too often carried away by the new possibilities in vocabulary and style that opened before them, by 'inkhorn' terms or rhetorical exuberance. One of the most famous pieces of Elizabethan prose is Lyly's *Euphues* (1579), which so abounds in antitheses, alliteration, otiose epithets, not to mention the unnatural natural history which provides material for its many similes, as to be unreadable with any attention to the matter. Here is a first sentence or two from the first page:

> 'This young gallaunt of more witte then wealth, and yet of more wealth then wisedome, seeing himselfe inferiour to none in pleasant conceits, though himselfe superiour to all in honest conditions, insomuch that he thought himselfe so apt to all thinges that he gaue himselfe almost to nothing but practising of those thinges commonly which are incident to these sharpe wittes, fine phrases, smooth quippes, merry tauntes, vsing iestinge without meane, and abusing mirth without measure. As therefore the sweetest Rose hath his prickell, the finest veluet his bracke, the fairest flower his branne, so the sharpest

> wit hath his wanton will, and the holiest head his wicked way. And true it is that some men write and most men beleeue, that in al perfect shapes, a blemmish bringeth rather a lyking euery way to the eyes, then a loathing any way to the minde.'

Now 'Euphuism' has been described as 'a necessary disease' of English Prose. Yet the Prayer Book had appeared in 1549 and Tyndale's New Testament in 1525. Euphuism was in fact but the plaything of courtly circles, and the Bible and Prayer Book represent a stronger and truer tradition of English prose. Again, in 1590 was published Sidney's *'Arcadia*, where the boundaries of prose and verse seem sometimes confused and the manner is often more important than the matter; *e.g.* 'The three days after, in the time that the morning did strew violets and roses in the heavenly floor against the coming of the sun,' or 'His arm no ofter gave blows than the blows gave wounds and the wounds gave death,' etc.

It seems as if the discipline of translation was needed to curb these full-blooded Elizabethans who treated English prose as young men do the power of arguing, according to Plato. For, apart from the Bible, I should regard North's *Plutarch* as about the most attractive work of Elizabethan prose. True, at the close of the sixteenth century two great writers duly subordinated style to thought and produced masterpieces — of the terse and pregnant style in Bacon's *Essays*, of the periodical style in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. But neither of these works were of such a nature as to influence the whole nation so widely as the Authorised Version, either by their thought or by their matter.

It appears to me, therefore, that the less poetic parts of the Bible, the narratives in the Old Testament, the Gospels and Epistles, played as important a part in the history of English literature as those parts most famous for their great literary qualities. For the chief virtue of prose style is to reveal and not conceal the thought beneath. Whenever our attention is withdrawn from the writer's meaning to consciousness of the means employed, danger arises. The 'beautiful obliquities' of Sir Thomas Browne delight our palate, but we hardly heed his thought, and I, at any rate, carry away from the essays of Matthew Arnold a clearer idea of the thought than I do from those of Pater.

Let us, while bearing this caution in mind, look at some of the peculiar merits of the Bible as literature. The Bible unites in unique degree nobility of thought with grandeur of expression. Here Milton alone in English literature rivals the Bible; but he has not that simplicity which is the third chief element in the literary greatness of the Bible.

The stories of the patriarchs appeal, as Wordsworth claimed that poetry should, to the primary human affections, those with which all men may sympathize irrespective of time and place, such as the love of a father for his son (Abraham and Isaac), a man serving to win his bride (Jacob), or a mother's preference for her younger son (Rebekka). It is the perennial appeal of a simple, unsophisticated society, and it is told with the nobility and dignity of early epic and in the same concrete language. What story is there more perfect than that of Joseph and his brethren? And the manner of its telling is that of Priam begging from Achilles the body of Hector in *Iliad* XXII. Both are free from the accumulation of irrelevant detail which besets much modern writing. We are not told what Joseph's wandering eye saw, unnoticing, while Judah slowly told his story.

If the best narrative parts of the Old Testament have this dignity and economy of style, they often have also a richness of expression which makes them live in our minds. Take, for example, the narrative of *I Kings* xxii. Ahab asks Jehosaphat to go with him against Ramoth Gilead. How is the consent expressed? 'I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses.' Or again, Naaman does not say 'Why wouldn't one of our homeland rivers serve the purpose?' but 'Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the rivers of Israel?'

Next to the virtues of dignity and simplicity in the Authorised Version comes the felicity of its rhythms. Prose rhythm is one of the most difficult subjects of study, and perhaps the only certain conclusion to be drawn is that there are no rules; that is to say that prose, unlike verse, does not employ or depend for its effect on any pattern recurring at regular intervals. The phrases which are naturally read or spoken together are composed of a large variety of feet, and no one need repeat another. All one can say is that some types of rhythm tend to occur more

often at the close of a period or sentence. You remember Godley, or at any rate the similar advice given us at school :

> 'An *esse videatur* at the close
> Makes it almost as good as anything of Cicero's.'

Well, some of the favourite Latin *clausulae* occur in English, but so do purely native rhythms, especially monosyllabic ones like 'But cán thése déad bónes líve?' Moreover our ear is affected quite as much by the combination of vowel sounds as by the combinations of long and short, or stressed and unstressed. And we must always remember how much familiarity and association may have influenced us, *e.g.* in preferring the Authorised Version to the Revised Version. If you doubt this take a few verses of the Prayer Book Psalter and compare it with the Bible. You probably prefer the former, Coverdale, to the Authorised Version, where elsewhere you would proclaim the unique virtues of the Authorised Version.

After this warning, let us consider a few passages in the Authorised Version in contrast with its predecessors or successors for rhythm. Wyclif translates *Isaiah* lx thus :

> 'Rise and be thou lightened Jerusalem, for thy light is comen and glory of the Lord is sprungen upon thee. For lo darkness shall hile the earth and thick mist shall hile the peoples. . . . And folk shulen wander in thy light, and Kings in shining of thy birth.'

Here the Authorised Version has the full play on the vowel 'i' (short and long) : 'A*rise*, *shine*, for thy *light* is come and the glory of the Lord is *ris*en upon thee.' In the next sentence Wyclif is too monosyllabic, and the repetition of 'hile' is clumsy : 'For *behold* the darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness the people.' In the third verse 'folk' is less pointed and sonorous than 'Gentiles'; and a monosyllabic ending ('birth') is flatter than a trochee : 'And the Gentiles shall come to thy light and kings to the brightness of thy rising.'

If I may diverge from Bible to Prayer Book, I would illustrate the same point by contrasting its splendid rhythms with the *Lay Folk's Psalter* in a MS. of *c.* 1420. Psalm xxiv begins :

> 'The earth and the fulness thereof is the lordis; the world and all that dwell therein is the lordis. For he founded it on the seas and *made it ready* on *floodis'*;

and the *Te Deum* has:

> 'Thou wert not *squoymous* to take the maidenes wombe to delyvere mankind.'

Ct. 'When thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man,
Thou didst not abhor the virgin's womb.'

The earlier version lacks rhythmical balance and 'squoymous' distresses us. I was once reading Moffat's translation of Deborah's song in church for the sake of freshness. When I saw ahead the last verse, 'They have taken a wench or two wenches apiece,' I felt compelled to a hasty reversion to 'damsel'! (Yet Tyndal uses 'wench' in translation, *Luke* ii, 56.)

Isaiah lxiii opens thus vigorously in Moffat: 'Who comes here, all crimsoned, his robes redder than the vintage? Who is it arrayed in splendour, striding in his strength, radiant with victory, a mighty champion?' It may be old association that makes us desiderate Edom and Bozra, but what can atone for the triple alliteration of 'r' in 'travelling in the greatness of his strength'? Again, Moffat begins ch. xl, 'Console my people, console them.' But the Authorised Version chose a word whose very sound, as Handel knew, had a wealth of consolation in it, 'Comfort ye.'

While we look to *Isaiah* or *Job* for the most magnificent and sonorous rhythms in the Bible, if not in all English literature, we must equally wonder at its simplicities and its silences: 'O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son'; and 'Jesus wept.'

The influence of the Bible on England may be considered as twofold, on English life and character and on English literature, though the two aspects are not ultimately separable.

'The English people [gradually] became the people of a book and that book the Bible' (J. R. Green). No other book has so permeated the hearts and heads of any people. It was more to them than Homer to the Greeks. In a public document of 1539 it was said:

> 'Englishmen have now in hand in every Church and place and almost every man the Holy Bible and New Testament in their mother tongue instead of the old fabulous and fantastic books of the *Table Round, Lancelot du Lac,* and such other, whose impure filth and vain fabulosity the light of God has abolished utterly.'

A great deal of the Authorised Version has been known by heart

to men of all classes, and its influence on speech and character has been all the more powerful where little or no other literature reached. The Bible was probably responsible for most of what has separated the English countryman from the cattle he tended, and was the basis of his morality and his speech. How much of the daily idiom of speakers and writers is traceable to the Bible! It would be tedious to cull from 'highways and hedges' examples of what is 'clear as crystal.' You would 'arise as one man' and 'smite me hip and thigh' till I 'licked the dust'!

These two kinds of influence, *i.e.* linguistic and moral, have affected practically all our literature. A narrower, and therefore more easily traceable, influence is seen best perhaps in Milton, Burke, Ruskin and Carlyle. But there is one author of the greatest interest in this connection because of his comparative ignorance of other literature than the Bible. I mean of course Bunyan. I regard *The Pilgrim's Progress* as the most perfect allegory in the English language. It succeeds where to my mind Spenser, attempting more, fails. Bunyan does not actually follow the Bible narrative as Milton did, and yet in his earnestness and sincerity of purpose, in his simplicity of construction and language combined with his vivid imagination and homely idiom, he has best reproduced the great qualities of the English Bible. One other man has been described as a man of one book, and that is Abraham Lincoln. If we compare his Gettysburg speech with, say, that ascribed by Thucydides to Brasidas, we need not take too seriously Somerset Maugham's suggestion that the Bible has injured our literature by its profusion of oriental imagery. The English Bible has the grand style where it is wanted for prophetic oratory, but its greatest virtue and glory is that it made the greatest collection of books in the world open to 'the boy that speeds the plough.'

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF THE REPORT OF THE DOCTRINAL COMMISSION*

I WILL begin what I have to say with a few observations on our aim and method in the construction and writing of this Report. I do not entertain any hope of improving upon the felicitous words in which the Archbishop of York has described our gatherings and conveyed the spirit which animated them, but each member of the Commission must have viewed our proceedings from his own angle, and I will try to convey some of my own impressions in my own words.

We were a miscellaneous company—almost as miscellaneous as the Church of England. It must be admitted that two types of doctrinal attitude had no representative among us: there was no one who refused on principle to admit the legitimacy of critical methods as applied to the text of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; again, there was no one who maintained that the Church of England, being a part of the Western Church, was *eo ipso* bound by whatever has been generally received within the Latin Church—always excepting the present claim of the Western Patriarch on our submission. No doubt if our company had included convinced and consistent adherents of these tenets it would have been a little more completely representative of the variety of the actual Church of England; no doubt also that if the Commission had included members of this kind, its progress would have been far more difficult and agreement in accepting a single document would probably have been impossible. With these two qualifications, I think it may be fairly claimed that all the chief varieties of teaching and of practice which are to be found within the Church of England were represented on the Commission.

At the outset of our labours we adopted a skeleton programme which appeared to include all the main heads of doctrine with which we were called upon to deal, and during the

* An address at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Churchmen's Union, Wednesday, May 18th, 1938, by the Rev. J. M. Creed, D.D., Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

long period of our sessions we worked steadily through the programme which we had set ourselves. The free interchange of ideas which was characteristic of all our discussions made the sessions of the Commission a very memorable experience for all who took part in them, and I sincerely hope that the text of the Report will convey the spirit of our gatherings to wider circles in the Church at large.

Turning now to the Report itself, I wish to draw attention to certain characteristics in Theological method which will be found to underlie it in all its parts.

(*a*) We have assumed that a Christian Theology rests and must rest upon 'a specific revelation of God in history'; that 'to this revelation Scripture and the Church alike bear witness'; and that inasmuch as 'the Church has always claimed that its doctrine is based on Scripture' the Scripture has a first claim on our consideration in dealing with the sources and authority of Christian doctrine (p. 27). This assumption is clearly stated at the outset and it conditions all that follows. It is no doubt a very far-reaching assumption and it gives rise to far-reaching questions as to the place of history in Theology—questions with which we have not attempted to deal in any detail. But the assumption is I think legitimate and indeed necessary for our purpose.

(*b*) While making this assumption we have throughout admitted in principle that the Scripture may be legitimately studied by the same critical and scientific methods which are applied to other documents. We have not always reached agreed conclusions in the application of the principle, but we have stated explicitly that

> 'belief that the Bible is the inspired record of God's self-revelation to man and of man's response to that revelation is not for us a dogma imposed as a result of some theory of the mode of the composition of the books, but a conclusion drawn from the character of their contents and the spiritual insight displayed in them.'

(*c*) Along with these two positive characteristics may be placed a third and negative characteristic which is the more noteworthy when the Report is placed in the setting of the contemporary Theological situation in Europe as a whole: the Report makes no consistent effort to construct a Confessional Orthodoxy on the basis of our Anglican Confessional standard, the

Thirty-Nine Articles—still less does it try to return to the Middle Ages and to work with neo-Thomist categories. Three brief but weighty paragraphs indicate our acceptance of the Articles as a doctrinal standard defining our position in Christendom, and explain the qualifications which may rightly accompany that acceptance. Not infrequently the teaching of the Articles is cited on particular points. But the problems of our time, as they have presented themselves to our minds, would have made it unsuitable and impracticable to take our sixteenth century Confession as the groundwork of a Doctrinal survey designed to serve the needs of the Church to-day.

Yet the Report does at some critical points shew that we have not been uninfluenced by one of the leading *motifs* in these modern attempts to return to the past: in so far as these movements testify to a recovered consciousness of the Divine transcendence as an essential element in Christian life and Christian thought, their temper is not uncongenial to many members of the Commission, and in the sections of the Report which deal with the doctrine of God, with the doctrine of the Church and with the Last Things a kindred spirit may be detected. Yet nowhere I think in our Report is this doctrine of Transcendence so asserted as to seem to confound the testimony of the reason and conscience of mankind. Rather does the Report encourage the belief that it is through reason and conscience that God must be apprehended if He is to be apprehended at all. (See Appended Note *On Discovery and Revelation*, p. 44.)

A month or two ago I read a report in *The Times* of an address delivered by one of my colleagues on the Commission, the Bishop of Derby. In this address the Bishop called attention to the remarkable measure of consent on fundamental points to which the Report testified. I agree with the Bishop. The measure of consent is I think really impressive. But Dr. Rawlinson proceeded to claim that the admitted divergences of opinion within the Commission were only on points of quite minor importance; and here I find myself obliged to qualify my agreement with him. Viewed absolutely these divergences are not perhaps of supreme importance; none the less I cannot regard them so complacently if we consider them in relation to the actual Church of England. Two issues were prominently

before the Church at the time the Commission was appointed, and while it was sitting, and these have inevitably affected the proportion and balance of the whole Report: first, the question of the Creeds, the kind of authority which they possess and the measure of freedom which may legitimately be claimed in their interpretation; and secondly, teaching and practice with regard to the Holy Communion. On neither of these issues does the Commission succeed in attaining unanimity, but in both I think it may be said that it does succeed in relating its differences to certain fundamental agreements. Thus with regard to doctrinal formularies — including of course the Creeds — the Commission as a whole draws a distinction between 'general acceptance' which, it is held, may reasonably be expected from members of the Church and 'detailed assent.'

> 'Assent to formularies,' it is said, 'and the use of liturgical language in public worship should be understood as signifying such general acceptance, without implying detailed assent to every phrase and proposition thus employed' (p. 38 f).

In the particular applications of this principle members of the Commission were not all of one mind. There were indeed more than two variations of emphasis, as the Report itself leads its readers to infer. I hope and think that most members of this Union will feel that positions which are widely accepted among its members receive clear and sufficient statement within the body of the Report itself, but even more important in my judgment than particular statements on controverted points is the general discussion of method which will be found in the Appended Note on the Resurrection (pp. 86 ff). Here the Report attempts to set out the main considerations to be borne in mind in forming an opinion on the subject under discussion. The agreement as to method which here comes to light seems to me to outweigh in significance the differences in the actual conclusions reached.

On the other issue — Eucharistic doctrine — the Report succeeds in shewing the wide area within which real community of feeling, thought and action is attainable, while at the same time it shews with clarity, good temper and restraint the points at which divergence arises. I shall not now try to summarize the long section of the Report which deals with this subject, but I ask your permission at this point to digress from the Report itself to consider its bearings upon a development in Church policy

which has arisen since the Report was published. It will be well known to most of my hearers that projects are now on foot for reopening the Prayer Book question of ten years ago, and for making an authoritative — though not a legal — ruling by some sort of synodical action on the part of Convocation. It is suggested that there is some obscurity as to the seat of lawful authority in the Church of England, and it has been proposed that this obscurity should be cleared up by a solemn Synodical Declaration by Convocation. To put the suggestion otherwise: the Houses of Convocation are to be invited themselves with their own breath to blow a loud blast upon their own trumpet. The very circumstance that such a proposal has been mooted makes it incumbent upon all who value the constitutional principles of the Church of England to recall for themselves and to remind others that a majority vote of the clerical assemblies is not and never has been in itself a sufficient authority for decisive action. Such a Declaration as has been proposed would not be a Canon, and if it were not a Canon, it would have no legislative force of any kind. This seems to be admitted, but it is urged that such a Declaration ought to carry and would carry a moral authority, appealing to the loyalty and binding the conscience of the clergy and the Church. I confess I am quite unable to understand how such a Declaration could of itself give Convocation any moral authority more than it already possesses. My impression is that the present moral authority of Convocation does not reach a very high level, nor, I submit, will that level rise until the majority are prepared to shew a more generous and a more courteous attitude to a minority which has behind it a sufficient weight of learning and experience and a sufficiently firm basis in the tradition of the Church of England to entitle its principles and opinions to respect. In saying this I have in mind particularly the recent pronouncements on the Marriage question, first in the Convocation and then in the Assembly.

The relevance of this digression to the Doctrine Report is this: prolonged discussion shewed and the Report testifies that there were unresolved differences of opinion on certain questions connected with the Sacrament of Holy Communion. With the Bishop of Derby I am most anxious to lay all the weight I can upon the central points of agreement, but in view of what

is now being mooted it is necessary to point out that the agreements of the Commission do not cover those issues which were responsible for the rejection of the Deposited Book ten years ago. I can imagine that a time may come when these differences will be resolved, but that time is not now. There is not now the slightest chance that Reservation of the Sacrament could be given the status of a fully-recognized practice of the Church of England as a whole, except on conditions which a considerable section of the clergy would unquestionably repudiate. The implication of the Doctrine Report, as I see it, is that the time is not ripe for a frontal attack by new legislation or by quasi-legislation on this vexed question, for there is no possibility at present that a change in the law of the Church could be carried with anything approaching general consent. Meantime I would deprecate the exaggerated language which is sometimes used as to the extent of present disorder, and on this point I am glad to refer to some recent words of the Bishop of Winchester. 'It was well known,' he said, 'that in two or three dioceses there was a large amount of disorder, but that was not true of the Church of England as a whole, and on the whole since 1928 the position had improved.' He deprecates the suggestion 'that there was at the present anything like chaos or widespread disorder within the Church of England.'[1]

This is not to say that we should complacently acquiesce in differences which obviously weaken the corporate life of the Church at a very sensitive point, but more must be done than has yet been done and more than the Doctrinal Commission has been able to do before the Church of England can reach an agreed solution. The difference, let it be noted, is a difference within the Church; it is not a difference between the Church on the one hand and the State on the other.

It will by now have become plain what kind of value I am disposed to claim for our Report as a whole. The very nature of our task and the composition of the Commission imposed limitations of which nobody could be more conscious than the members themselves. The higher achievements of thought in the sphere of Theology as in other spheres are attained in the

[1] *Chronicle of Convocation*, May, 1938, p. 86. A speech in the Upper House, January 20th.

minds of individual thinkers who respond to and have learnt to master the whole environment in which their generation lives. These higher achievements do not come from Committees. And our Report is the outcome of Committee work. Almost every paragraph has had a history. An original draft has been interpolated, amended, combined with matter from another hand, and too often it has lost its freshness in the process. It was inevitable that we should work so, if we were to fulfil our function. Briefly, I think it has been our function to promote the coherence and stability of the Church of England by demonstrating the large area of unforced consent among Churchmen of different schools and at the same time to allow for the sufficient elucidation of divergent views where divergence arises. As I close I should like to be allowed to testify to the harmonious temper of our body not only in its agreement but also in its disagreements, and also to the general willingness — indeed the general concern — that serious opinions seriously and responsibly maintained should receive fair statement. Only when this concern has been recalled can the agreements of the Report be estimated at their proper value.

'RELIGIOUS CONFORMITY' AND 'CLERICAL VERACITY'

By T. J. Wood, M.A.

THE publication of the Doctrinal Report and the discussions upon it have brought back to the minds of the older generation the battle which took place in the 'nineties between Professor Henry Sidgwick, then Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, and the Rev. Hastings Rashdall, then Fellow of New College, Oxford. Both the subject-matter and the methods of approach are so relevant to the present situation that it may be of interest to recapitulate details and to estimate how far the situation has changed in the interval.

It began with a lecture given by Professor Sidgwick to the West London Ethical Society in November, 1895, and published in the *International Journal of Ethics*, April, 1896. It was on

'The Ethics of Religious Conformity,' a subject in which his interest was more than academic, for he had resigned his Fellowship at Trinity because he felt that he could no longer accept the religious qualification upon which it had rested.

Sidgwick outlined the extreme views (*a*) of the simple minded, that the Church was an association of persons holding certain distinctive doctrines and that directly a member had made up his mind against any important doctrine explicitly adopted by his Church it was better for him to withdraw; and (*b*) of those who thought the question so difficult and complex that it had better be left entirely to the conscience of the individual. Against the first view he argued that it did not correspond with the facts, for it was not expected that a man should withdraw because he had ceased to hold some fundamental doctrine, and there were other considerations such as ties of affection, habit and religious sympathy which told against his doing so; 'a man who feels no impulse to leave a community, and sees no religious or moral gain in joining another, can hardly be expected to excommunicate himself.' Sidgwick's utilitarian principles compelled him to grant a 'certain economy in the utterance of what one believed to be true,' and the important point appeared to him to be that a man 'should neither betray a confidence reposed in him by others, nor give them fair reason for believing that he holds opinions which he does not hold.'

In applying this test to members of the Church of England, Sidgwick made the assumption that 'there can be no doubt that a member of the Church of England is formally pledged to believe the Apostles' Creed. But it is clearly impossible to take this pledge literally.' Here is the crucial point. What degree of intellectual dissent is tolerable? We can ignore the case of the laity, except those applying for posts in which membership of the English Church is required as a condition of appointment, and consider the case of appointed teachers of the Church.

Sidgwick took the Apostles' Creed because its use in the Baptismal Service 'attaches to it with special emphasis the character of a summary of the doctrine which the minister has been appointed to teach.' To repeat this Creed, week by week, while not really believing it, was to break the rules of both veracity and good faith, and 'no gain which the Anglican ministry may receive from the presence of such men can compensate

for the damage done to moral habits, and the offence given to moral sentiments, by their example.' While

> 'the utmost breadth of interpretation should be granted, the utmost variety of meanings allowed which the usage of language, especially the vagueness of many fundamental notions, will fairly admit,'

Sidgwick asserted that

> 'there is one line of thought which is not compatible with them (the Creeds), and that is the line of thought which, taught by modern science and modern historical criticism, concludes against the miraculous element of the gospel history, and in particular rejects the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus.'

While he sympathized with those who were trying to separate the ethical and religious elements in the Creeds, he thought it could not 'properly be done within the pale of the Anglican ministry.'

This challenge remained unanswered for some time, until Hastings Rashdall was asked to take it up, and his reply was published in January, 1897. He justified liberty of interpretation on the grounds of a general understanding that it was 'legitimate to subscribe the Articles in a very elastic and unnatural sense,' and that the same understanding applied to the Creeds and to the Bible. The fact that a clergyman only subscribed the Articles at certain times in his life, but repeated the Creeds weekly, did not imply that he had to take the latter more literally than the former.

Two points were made by Rashdall which are of great importance in any discussion of the question of credal subscription and are applicable to the situation to-day, *viz*:

1. It is not in 'miracles' as such that a clergyman is required to believe, but in 'certain events commonly conceived of as miraculous.' The modern approach to miracles is very different from the old. They were formerly regarded as proofs of a Divine revelation which without the attestation of miracles could not be accepted as Divine; to-day men recognize that miracles cannot prove a Divine revelation to be Divine. The proof is to be found solely in the appeal which that revelation makes to the rational, moral and spiritual consciousness of the individual or community.

> 'To anyone who holds that the central doctrine of Christianity rests upon grounds other and quite distinct from the historical evidence for the miracles of Christ, the whole question of miracles becomes one of secondary importance,'

and so a clergyman is at liberty to be silent about them before a 'congregation of rustics.' Only the individual can decide the question as to the essentiality of any belief.

2. It is impossible to draw a hard and fast line at any point and say 'These miracles must be believed' and 'These need not.' From the point of view of subscription all the miracles of the Bible are on the same footing; no distinction can be drawn on this ground between the miracles of the Old and the New Testaments. Neither can the line be drawn within the Creeds. 'There are clauses in both the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed which most orthodox clergymen would explain in a way different from that which was probably intended by their authors,' *e.g.* the descent into hell and the resurrection of the body.

> 'It is possible for those who reject the miraculous birth to find in the clause "Conceived by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary" a meaning scarcely further removed from its historical import than the generally received sense of not a few other Articles.' [1]

Rashdall regarded the law-courts as being the authorized interpreters of the obligations imposed by law upon the clergy, and the decisions in the case of the writers in *Essays and Reviews* as a charter of theological freedom for the clergy.

On the positive side, Rashdall argued that the Church was primarily a society for the presentation of the Christian ideal of life, and only secondarily 'an association of persons holding certain theological doctrines,' and that it was absurd to suggest that every advance in theological enlightenment should lead to a fresh schism.

> 'In comparison with the importance of maintaining and extending (the Christian koinonia [fellowship]) the non-natural interpretation of a clause or two here and there in formularies with which they feel a general sympathy will seem . . . a very small evil.'

Those who believe that the highest hopes for society are only to be realized by the increased activity, co-operation, comprehensiveness and unification of the Christian Church 'will feel that nothing but the clearest categorical imperatives ought to prevent

[1] 'The importance rightly or wrongly attached to the Virgin Birth was no doubt largely due to the feeling that a birth in accordance with the ordinary laws of nature would involve the inheritance of the sinful qualities inherent in human flesh. Those who believe (as many even among Unitarians do believe) that Jesus Christ was without sin may thus be said to accept the spiritual truth which the early Church, rightly or wrongly, associated with a certain physical or historical fact.'

persons otherwise attracted to the task from accepting or retaining the orders of the English Church.' He suggested, therefore,

> (*a*) that the declaration of belief in the whole Bible at the ordination of deacons should be brought into line with that at priesthood, viz.: 'I believe that Holy Scripture containeth sufficiently all things necessary to salvation,' and
>
> (*b*) that some change should be made in the form of assenting to creeds.

Sidgwick replied with an article on 'Clerical Veracity,' in which he still took the recitation of the Creeds to imply belief in the marvels therein affirmed, and their disbelief to imply 'a hard, flat, unmistakable falsehood.' He limited the freedom of interpretation to those cases where words originally used literally had come to be used metaphorically 'so long as the meaning is one which the phrase in question will admit without any violent straining' (a qualification obviously vague and subjective). In the case of the Virgin Birth the phrase has 'a perfectly simple and definite negative meaning,' and cannot have only a metaphorical one. Only a public announcement of the denial would excuse one from the charge of unveracity, and such a public denial would be such a shock to the moral sentiment of the plain man that the Church would have to decide either not to tolerate the denier or to remove the Apostles' Creed from its place in the service.

Obviously whether any phrase of the Creeds is capable of 'symbolic' interpretation depends very largely upon one's knowledge and outlook in science and historical criticism, as well as upon the place which the belief holds in one's scheme of things, and Sidgwick revealed the real reason why he could not reconcile the denial of the Virgin Birth with an acceptance of Christianity when he said:

> 'For if the methods of modern criticism are by anyone allowed to prevail so far, against scriptural narratives and ecclesiastical tradition, as to lead to the rejection of the miraculous birth of Jesus, it must be an exceptionally constituted mind that can find the authority of the evangelists still sufficient to sustain the vast weight of Nicene Theology.'

Other miracles will have to be given up, Christianity will soon come to have a purely ethical import, and the Divine Sonship of Jesus will only be affirmed in the sense of unique consciousness of the relation existing, essentially or ideally, between the human

spirit and the divine. This momentous breach with tradition ought to be effected openly.

The discussion ended there, but received illumination from Professor Bernard Bosanquet's review of Sidgwick's *Practical Ethics*, which included the two articles mentioned. Bosanquet's views are refreshing, and especially valuable as coming from an independent observer and a trained philosopher. He criticized Sidgwick for not considering the way in which the individuals, whose conduct was being discussed, were likely, or not likely, to make the most of their lives, and to do the best with the complex of relations which formed their eithical being:

> 'But it seems to me—the complaint may make Professor Sidgwick smile—as if he took the documents too seriously, and the societies themselves not seriously enough.'

The primary question, in Bosanquet's view, was not whether a minister believed the documents of his Church or not, but

> 'whether, reading together the various formularies and accepted expressions of the Church's doctrine, and considering its history and present work and aims, its cause seems one desirable to promote, and one in promoting which the individual could find his best life's work.'
>
> 'The society is the first thing, and its documents are secondary; while any one document apart from the others is tertiary or lower.'

If absolute agreement were necessary on all points co-operation would become impossible.

> 'So long as he approves of the actual work and its leading principles, he is entitled to regard many disagreements, even in the representation of facts, as matters of detail. How far the solemn profession of belief alters the matter is a further question.'

Into that further question Bosanquet did not enter, but he appended the following footnote:

> 'I believe that failure to apply a high standard to the work of religious communities is more common and more serious than undue acceptance of their formulae; and I think that the former failing is encouraged by any criticism which gives documents independent value.'

This hint of Bosanquet's finds echo in the Introduction to the Doctrinal Report, which states:

> 'If God is Love, it is only among people animated by mutual love that understanding of Him can be advanced. To admit acrimony in theological discussion is in itself more fundamentally heretical than any erroneous opinions upheld or condemned in the course of the discussion' (p. 23).

In this three-sided discussion there are set forth all the essentials of the problem of the right to interpret the Creeds, even the 'historical' clauses, and no new factors have since been

introduced. But the relative emphasis upon the points raised has been altered considerably.

To put it briefly. Sidgwick regarded the Apostles' Creed as a document binding upon the clergy, containing some clauses which by general consent could be taken metaphorically and others to be taken literally. It did not, apparently, occur to him that the Creeds were the product of historical developments within the Church and that their meaning must therefore be sought in relation to the questions at issue at various times and to the forms of thought and expression into which the underlying beliefs had to be expressed. The faith, therefore, which the reciter must be regarded as accepting must be the faith lying behind the Creeds, and not the particular words in which the ancient Church expressed that faith.

This is a danger in the situation to-day, for while this attitude has been realized in official circles, and embodied in reunion formulae, the less educated, both among the clergy and laity, still imagine that the words of the Articles, Prayer Book and Creeds are to be taken 'in the plain and full meaning thereof.'

Secondly, the progress of historical and Biblical criticism has enlarged the area of the 'symbolic' element in the Creeds. There are, no doubt, many who would like to fix the point at which symbolism must end, and who imagine that any further extension of concession to criticism must so undermine the authority of the Creeds and the Scriptures that the 'plain man' will be left without guidance in his religious life.

But the preservation of the authority of the Christian witness is not to be sought by fixing its limits, 'thus far and no farther'; that is the fault of Uzzah. It is doubtful whether the limits can be laid down with any greater precision than is given in the Doctrinal Report:

> 'It is, however, in any case essential to hold that the facts underlying the Gospel story — which story the Creeds summarize and interpret—were such as to justify the Gospel itself' (p. 38).

Bosanquet was right in pointing out that the maintenance of a Christian standard of life was more important than literal acceptance of formulae, thus recalling us to the words of the Founder of Christianity:

> 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven.'

THE BLACK INTERNATIONAL

By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

IT is an historical commonplace to say that the Reformation was a very long time in coming. But the truth is that revolutions arrive when the time is ripe and not before; a number of different factors contribute to the explosion, and until these are all assembled there is a deceptive appearance of calm. And then of course some delaying force may display itself, and reduce the instability of the explosive mixture, so that the bomb never bursts.

Something of this sort happened in the thirteenth century. By all ordinary reckoning, most of the materials for an explosion were present, but the danger passed and nothing happened for two or three centuries. The Church got a reprieve. It is, of course, a mistake to regard the Middle Ages as ages of faith; they were, as Dr. Coulton has remarked, Ages of Acquiescence, when weeds of heresy were plentiful, but were kept close cropped.[1] The fact is often forgotten that in the thirteenth century Christendom was faced by a rival culture, intellectually more advanced than its own — the Graeco-Arabian culture of Islam. The existence of such a culture was a permanent menace to the Church.

The agency which prevented a collapse was none other than the Mendicant friars, Franciscan and Dominican. The former laid emphasis upon poverty, the latter upon theology, and both contributed to keep the Church in being — the Franciscans by good works as well as by preaching, the Dominicans by their learning and their preaching and teaching.

> 'Very soon after St. Francis's death, by 1230 or so, the Mendicants began to capture the Universities, where their frugality and their consuming enthusiasm rendered them the most popular and efficient teachers. In 1260 St. Bonaventura, then Franciscan Minister General and Professor at Paris, set the official seal upon this intellectual movement. . . . Until the very end of the Middle Ages the majority of Schoolmen, and the best Schoolmen, were friars.'[2]

[1] *Inquisition and Liberty* (1938), preface and p. 58.

[2] Coulton, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

Here then was a step forward; men had been attracted to the heretics by their poverty and self-denial, but here were orthodox missionaries as poor and as serviceable. The heretics, too, had known their Bible, but the friars now knew it better still. 'There was in their convents an elaborate ladder of theological education; at the Universities, friars of conspicuous ability lectured on the whole Bible text.' A Dominican produced a Concordance to the Vulgate towards the end of the thirteenth century — a work still used at the present day. Thus the ground was cut from under the heretics' feet.[3] Moreover the Dominicans, in the persons of Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas Aquinas, baptized into Christ the alien and more advanced Graeco-Arabian culture which menaced Christendom — a tremendous achievement, and the work was so thoroughly done that St. Thomas's work still remains authoritative for the Roman Catholic Church, while our own day has witnessed a revival of Scholasticism.

It is indeed true that the Dominicans did not rely solely upon reason and argument. Though to the Church they were 'God's sheepdogs,' there were others to whom these sinister figures, clothed in their black scapulars, seemed more to resemble Noah's raven. The Dominicans it was who ran the Inquisition, crushing heresy, not by reason but by prison, torture, and fire — a dreadful story upon which we need not dwell. The Dominicans became not only the scholars but the Secret Police of the Church.

The situation in the sixteenth century was very different from that presented by the thirteenth; new forces had arisen, notably the three following: Humanism (partly literary and partly scientific); a new type of 'totalitarian' ruler (for example, the Tudor sovereigns in England); and a merchant and commercial class, the product largely of the new geographical discoveries and the consequent increase of wealth and currency. The forces of revolt, or of 'heresy,' were now very much stronger than they had been in the thirteenth century. To begin with, Humanism was an intellectual movement *within* Christendom, and not outside it, as Graeco-Arabian science and philosophy had so largely

[3] Coulton expressly says, 'It is mainly owing to Francis and Dominic that the religious revolution was postponed from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century' (*op. cit.*, p. 202).

been. In the next place, the new absolute monarchs, allied with the new commercial class, formed an extremely strong hostile combination; the Church had never had to face anything of the kind before—for even Frederick II had joined with the Church in persecuting heretics, unbeliever as he was.

Theoretically, the dangerous situation might have been met by the same champions who defeated the enemy in the crisis of the thirteenth century—to wit, the Franciscans and Dominicans, who were still in existence. But in practice new weapons were needed and new men to use them. Would a new Francis or Dominic arise to save Catholicism in its dire need? The crisis did indeed produce the man.

As might have been expected, he came from that country where Catholicism and nationalism had been welded into one in centuries of bloody struggle with Islam; and by a curious irony of fate it was within a few years, perhaps within a few months, of the Moors finally quitting Spain that Ignatius Loyola was born.

The story of Loyola's disablement at the siege of Pampeluna by the French (1521), and his subsequent conversion and decision to devote himself to a life of religion, is well known. The point about Loyola was that he was a soldier who remained a soldier to the end. His famous hand-book, the *Spiritual Exercises*, is in reality a manual of drill—drill for making an efficient soldier in the Church's battle against heresy and infidelity. The Spanish word *compania*, by which he described his new Order, has the same twofold meaning as the word *company* in English; that is to say, it *can* be a military term, and it may well be that Loyola chose it for this reason. The title 'General' had been already given by religious Orders to their superiors, but the head of the new 'Company of Jesus' was General indeed, for the power with which he was invested was purely despotic. He stood above criticism. Moreover, in the Jesuit Society, as in an army, implicit obedience was obligatory to the officer immediately superior; and the obedience had to be, literally, 'corpse-like.' And, like an army, these Janissaries of the Church were mobile. They were not tied, like the Benedictines, to a place, nor, like the Friars, to a garb. They were here, there, and everywhere, and no man knew where they were. They had no attachments, and but one loyalty—to their superior officer, whoever he might

be. Their bodies and souls, their minds, wills and consciences were his.

In a new and very interesting book upon the Jesuits,[4] Mr. F. A. Ridley produces much evidence to show that in devising the rules of his Order, Loyola was an adapter rather than an originator in the strict sense, and his models, it would appear, were the Mohammedan rather than the Christian monastic orders, though their influence upon him may have been indirect.

Certain dervish orders, bound by monastic rules, had become a regular feature of the Islamic world from the end of the twelfth century, both in the orthodox fold and among the heretical sects. These orders betray some startling similarities to Loyola's new society. Among the Muslims the principle of unlimited 'corpse-like' obedience prevailed, and also the Jesuit principle of centralization of authority. The most famous of the heretical Islamic orders was that of the Hashishin, known to Europeans as the 'Assassins,' amongst whom the practice of corpse-like obedience was such that, at the command of his superior, a dervish would fling himself without hesitation from a lofty tower.

> 'In all essentials the Jesuit Society is a Dervish order, translated from the world of Islam to that of Catholicism with hardly the omission of a comma. The Jesuit Order may justly be styled the last—and the greatest—of the Muslim orders of Dervishes.' [5]

The Mendicant Friars, as we have seen, met the situation with which the Church was faced, partly by good works and poverty, and partly by scholarship and preaching. Thus they won the common people as well as the educated. But the Jesuits were faced with a yet more difficult situation, and they tackled it with characteristic determination and with a complete understanding of the forces involved. The first of the three dangerous forces mentioned above, Humanism, the Jesuits countered by elaborating a system of education in which they included the classical culture of the Renaissance. As for the new type of

[4] *The Jesuits*. Secker and Warburg. 10/6.

[5] Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 203. 'You will be in the hands of your Sheikh as a corpse in the hands of him who washes the dead,' says the *Book of Duties* of the Sheikh Si-Snoussi—a sufficiently close parallel to 'Let those who live in obedience allow themselves to be disposed of at the will of their superior like a corpse which permits one to turn and handle it in any way one pleases' (*Constitutions of the Company of Jesus*, Pt. VI, ch. 1). Ridley supplies other parallels as close.

totalitarian ruler, in order to cope with Courts the Jesuits became courtiers, and made a speciality of guiding the consciences of the great. As for the new rising commercial class, it would not appear that this was very amenable to Jesuit influences; but it certainly was the case that the Jesuit casuists increased the power and influence of the confessional over the general public by making things easier for the penitent. Not that they discouraged piety, though a high authority has noted the complete dearth of Catholic mystics from the late sixteenth century down to the present day. A certain change would indeed seem to have come over Catholic piety since the Counter-Reformation (which was so largely a Jesuit achievement), which displayed itself in the two arts of painting and architecture. In the latter sphere Baroque replaced Gothic, while paintings 'began no longer to represent the saints as kneeling calmly in adoration, but as waving their arms and stretching their necks and rolling their eyes, in ecstasies of sensuous longing, while they tear aside their clothes to relieve their burning bosoms.' A tendency now became common 'to substitute a subrational expansion of feeling for a superrational concentration of will.' No one can read Loyola's directions in the *Exercises* about the application of the senses to a subject of contemplation without agreeing that there is some justification for Mr. Aldous Huxley's remark that every effort is made, not to suppress the image-forming phantasy—that worst obstacle, according to St. John of the Cross and all the earlier mystics, in the way of a genuine intuition of ultimate reality—but to develop it, if possible, to the pitch of hallucination.[6] Besides this development of an emotional piety, an increased emphasis upon sacraments is also characteristic of Counter-Reformation Catholicism (imitated to-day by an Anglicanism ignorant of mediaeval piety), and the Jesuits, perhaps, may take some of the credit for this.

But perhaps it was in their relations with the Papacy that the Jesuits made the longest advance upon the earlier policy of the Mendicant Orders three hundred years before. Their policy was to make themselves indispensable to the Pope, and then to exalt his power, thus increasing their own prestige at the same time. So well recognized was this policy (and so successful also) that

[6] *Ends and Means*, p. 292.

the General of the Jesuits was popularly known as the Black Pope, who, of the two Popes, was by far the more powerful. The White Pope became more and more like the king in a game of chess. The truth was that in dangerous times the Popes needed the Jesuits. The Society suffered an eclipse in the eighteenth century when times were quiet, but they came to their own again after the French Revolution, and since then they have been among the ablest of counter-revolutionaries.

It was undoubtedly in their Missions, which extended in a surprisingly short space of time literally from China to Peru, that the Society of Jesus appears at its best, displaying not only the most uncompromising self-sacrifice, but also the most remarkable adaptability. St. Francis Xavier died while seeking admission into China (1552), but before the end of the century the Jesuits had established themselves in Pekin, where their abilities as mathematicians and astronomers won them great respect. The Jesuits were prepared to baptize into Christ considerable portions of indigenous Chinese culture—the writings of Confucius, for example, and the worship of ancestors. The history of the Jesuit Socialist Utopia in Paraguay is well known. Between 1608 and 1768 the Order secured from the Crown of Spain the lease of a number of native reservations inhabited by Indians of a primitive kind, but amenable to guidance and direction. Here, insulated from the rest of the world, the Jesuit Fathers organized, under their beneficent rule, a unique economic and social system. The population of this happy state at its zenith would appear to have been some 150,000. Scientific agriculture was introduced, and an army raised, drilled and led by the Fathers themselves, defeating Brazilian slave-traders and foreign entrepreneurs who were anxious to exploit the imaginary riches of the country. What riches there were, were the result of industry and careful organization, and when the Jesuits were temporarily dissolved in the eighteenth century, the whole work was brutally and cold-bloodedly destroyed out of sheer greed by stronger and more 'civilized' neighbours. It is, of course, to these Jesuit missionaries that the world owes the discovery of quinine, extracted from Chincona, or Jesuits' Bark.

Thus the respective crises of the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries were met by Catholicism because the Church was able

to produce orders of devoted men to fight its battles. First the Franciscans and Dominicans, and then the Jesuits. Upon the weaknesses of all these Orders it is easy to dwell, for they were composed of men, and where there is human nature there will be imperfection. The 'holy poverty' of the Franciscans may in due course have declined into something less rigid, while the scholarship of the Dominicans was allied to a persecuting zeal which we find it hard to condone — especially as persecution has again returned to Europe. As for the Jesuits, they can be accused of intrigue and cunning, of allowing a good end (or what they claimed to be such) to be attained by discreditable means, of casuistry inconsistent with sound ethics, and so on. To dwell on these aspects of the Society of Jesus, if it tempts to self-righteousness in the critic, is not profitable; it is better to seek what lessons can be learned from this singular body of men, who after all were successful in saving Catholicism from collapse — a considerable achievement, one must admit. What, in short, were their virtues?

Their virtues were of a practical kind, and by no means easy of attainment: Courage, determination, self-discipline, obedience, self-sacrifice, and patience; while they also believed, no less than the Dominicans, in education (provided it were in their hands), and, in an age when science was beginning to grow up, in science — for examples, astronomy and scientific agriculture (incidentally one of the most civilizing sciences there is). But in addition to the above many of the Jesuits, and not least the founder of the Order, were characterized by a certain simplicity. Soldiers are often simple men who see their duty clear and have no hesitations about doing it. Loyola was not at all a subtle man: all problems were simple enough to him, and he knew that where there is a will there is a way. Mr. Ridley, who is no particular friend to the Jesuits, not being a counter-revolutionary himself, says that probably it was their simplicity which enabled them to deal so successfully with the simple-minded Indians of Paraguay. Also this quality enabled them to be successful demagogues. They had none of Pascal's depth and subtlety, yet in spite of the *Provincial Letters*, it was not Port Royal that won.

What can Modernists, faced with the twin enemies materialism and obscurantism (which is religious materialism) learn from

the story of the Jesuits? They may learn, perhaps, that the mere fact that a cause is reasonable will not ensure its victory. It is *men* who win victories, not ideas. Can believers in love, freedom, and truth display the practical qualities—the self-discipline, the self-sacrifice, the patience, the courage, the common sense—which enabled the Jesuits to influence the course of history? To entertain the right ideas is not enough, even though it may be much. It is the character and conduct of those who hold the ideas which count.

BOOK REVIEWS

FRESH LIGHT ON THE NEW TESTAMENT*

The parochial clergy, like Martha, are cumbered with much serving. They are anxious and troubled about many things which did not disturb the comparatively even tenor of their predecessors' ways. As the Church's hold on the people has slackened, the ecclesiastical organization has concurrently become more complex. An organism rooted in the soil of history is undergoing a process of transmutation into an elaborate machine in which the parish priest is a cog. Thinking is no necessary part of a cog's function. And yet in an age when new knowledge increases with disturbing rapidity it is important that the man, who in the parish provides the one point of contact between the mass of the people and the Church, should be in touch with the best knowledge of the time and should himself so assimilate it that he is able to hand it on effectively. Otherwise the gap between the world of thought and the world of the lay Churchman, already too wide, will broaden disastrously. We therefore welcome books such as the recently published volume on the New Testament by Dr. Kirsopp Lake and Dr. Silva Lake.* They meet the needs of the present situation. They put the parochial clergyman in touch with the world of genuine scholarship.

Dr. Kirsopp Lake and his collaborator have arranged their matter with great skill and have attained the necessary compression without any sacrifice of clarity. They put at the disposal of their readers the broad results of New Testament scholarship, give a clear account of the main problems with which it is concerned, and indicate the lines along which they may find a solution. Their book provides an admirable refresher for the man whose knowledge has become rather rusty. Its style is easy and readable and frequently incisive. If the reader should wish to pursue further some particular line of New Testament study, he will find in this book a clear map of

* *An Introduction to the New Testament.* By Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake. (Published by Christophers. Price 7/6 net. 1938.)

the region he wishes to explore and an invaluable bibliographical guide for his journey.

The book consists of two parts. The first part starts with two chapters on the Synoptic Gospels, and then proceeds to discuss the remaining books of the New Testament individually. A detailed discussion is neither possible nor attempted; but the salient points are clearly indicated and the whole is placed in admirable perspective and proportion. The second part describes the Jewish and Hellenist background to the New Testament, and deals with the relationship of the New Testament to this background.

The great scholars of the nineteenth century approached the Synoptic problem in the main by the method of literary analysis. They reached results which are of permanent value and cannot be seriously challenged. It is, however, now a commonplace of criticism that the problem is not exclusively literary. The Gospels reflect the problems and conditions of the first generation of Christianity. The student must take into account the influences which were at work during the period between the Crucifixion and their composition. He has some indications of what they were from *Acts* and the Gospels, but he can only make use of these indications by using his historical imagination. The chief virtue of Form Criticism is that it has stimulated this kind of constructive imagination. It has its obvious dangers and weaknesses. Imaginative construction degenerates into fanciful hypothesis unless it be rigorously restrained by reference to such facts as are available. The Form Critics try to get behind the written Gospels by adopting the methods of specialists in the literature of mediaeval folklore. These sought to date folk-tales by examining the form of their introduction and conclusion. The Form Critic thinks that by considering their form he can isolate stories and sections, later incorporated in *Mark*, but existing at an earlier date in a written form. Professor Lake doubts it. He dryly remarks that

> 'the fact that a terminology originally used for classifying the tales of folk-lore can be used for stories in *Mark* does not prove anything except that it can be used.'

He asks for evidence that the prior development postulated by the Form Critics took place, and finds none. He considers that the general unity of St. Mark's style is strong evidence against it. The Form Critics make much play with the alleged influence of the 'community' on the formation of the units which they think that they can discern in the Gospels. Professor Lake retorts that during the first stage of the spread of Christianity, though there were communities, there was no 'community.' They also stress the formative influence of preaching. Here again Professor Lake is sceptical. He points out that the evidence of *Acts* and the *Epistles* shows that the teaching of the Apostles was very different from preaching in the ordinary sense of the word, the kind of preaching which the Form Critics assume.

The external evidence for the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is strong. The internal evidence against it is conclusive. Professor Lake considers that the evidence for its Ephesian origin is not strong apart from the external evidence, and that if the validity of the external evidence is impugned, the question of the place of origin is re-opened. The Philonic influence on the Gospel suggests an Alexandrian origin, a suggestion which is reinforced by the discovery of the Egyptian papyrus published in 1935 under the title *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*. This papyrus belongs to the first half of the second century and contains Johannine material. The Fourth Gospel was therefore read and used as a source in Egypt before 150 A.D.

The theology of the Synoptic Gospels is non-sacramental. That of the Fourth Gospel is sacramental. Professor Lake holds that the Fourth Gospel already represents the essential doctrines of Catholic Christianity in respect of the Divinity of Jesus, Baptism and the Eucharist, and the supernatural character of the Church. He agrees with those scholars who believe that sacramental Christianity was unknown to Jesus and to His first disciples, but was the invention of Hellenistic Christians. It finds expression in the Fourth Gospel but has had no influence on the Synoptics.

> 'In fact, the absence of sacramental doctrine in the Synoptics remains a problem for the Catholic, and the presence of it in the Church a problem for the non-Catholic.'

The book concludes with appendices on the Chronology of the New Testament, the Topography of the New Testament, and a collection of quotations representative of early 'tradition' about the origin of the Gospels.

G. L. H. Harvey.

AN ACADEMIC PIE*

The astonishing thing about this book is its size. It is not unusual for a dozen pupils of some senior scholar to present to him a volume of essays, but seldom indeed does such a volume contain contributions from some thirty-five authors, or appear in so imposing a form. Professor Lake must be gratified to realize the extent of his influence and the regard in which he is held.

The range of studies represented is wide. As one would expect, the Criticism of the New Testament, and in particular Textual Criticism, is most prominent, but there are articles on 'The Sibyl and the Bottle Imps' by Campbell Bonner, 'Reflections on a Synagogue Inscription' by B. D. Erdmans, 'The Origin of Christian Architecture' by L. Hugues Vincent, 'The Early Muslim Sects' by William Thomson, and a great many more. Such a book contains something to interest everyone, though it is hardly

* *Quantulacumque*. Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake by pupils, colleagues and friends. (London: Christophers. 21/- net. 1938.)

to be expected that everyone will be equally interested in all its contents. Here it is only possible to notice a few of the contributions.

Dr. Cadbury has an interesting chapter on 'Rebuttal, a Submerged Motive in the Gospels,' in which he evaluates the methods of *Formgeschichte*. Perhaps he overstates the case when he says that 'Form Criticism has helped clear our minds of any cherished hope of surviving chronology even in Mark,' but no doubt he is right in emphasizing the importance of 'motive' in the composition of the individual units of which the Gospels are composed. Not least important among such motives was a desire to refute criticism from non-Christian sources; and, in fact, this has long been recognized.

Dr. R. P. Casey, who is one of the editors of the volume, follows with a brief essay on *Formgeschichtliche Methode,* which he finds in some ways unconvincing.

> 'It is difficult to resist the impression that in spite of many acute observations in matters of detail, *Formgeschichtliche Kritik* in its broad lines marks a return to the methods of the eighteenth century rationalists. It is not primarily a literary but a philosophical and historical theory; its literary corollaries derive in the main from a previously determined reconstruction of the facts of early Christian history and psychology.'

These are bold words; and the question is pertinent,

> 'Why, if the gospel sections were in constant circulation for homiletic purposes, do they survive only in non-homiletic form? Why do we have so many materials for one kind of sermon, but, in the early period, only sermons of the other kind?'

In the field of Textual Criticism, Sir Frederic Kenyon contributes a welcome note on the Chester Beatty Gospels and Acts: 'It is evident that if the papyrus is not wholly Alexandrian, it is still less Western.' 'Not one of the larger Western divergences occurs in it.' Some essays are of a very technical nature, notably a long chapter by Höeg and Zuntz on the Prophetologion, with some fine reproductions of MSS. Towards the end there is a challenging chapter on 'Crisis in Ezekiel Research' by George Dahl of Yale. It is doubtful whether scholars in this country will accept the theory that 'Ezekiel is a late pseudepigraph of Palestinal provenance,' to be dated about 225 B.C. Not enough recognition seems to have been given to local colour in which the book abounds. As Lods says with reference to a much less extreme hypothesis,

> 'A theory which makes it necessary to relegate to the domain of fiction the numerous allusions, all perfectly sober and natural, to those Babylonian surroundings in which the hero of the book lived, does not seem to us convincing.'

Quantulacumque contains articles in German and French, but as a whole it is a notable monument to contemporary American scholarship, scholarship which Kirsopp Lake has done so much to stimulate.

P. Gardner-Smith.

'UNDERSTANDEST THOU WHAT THOU READEST?'*

The results of historical and literary research possessed to-day by scholars of the New Testament outstrip enormously the knowledge of the New Testament possessed by ordinary Christian people—whether belonging to the educated or to the uneducated classes. To do something to bridge this gulf is a matter of urgent necessity and also of no little difficulty.

Mr. Guy Kendall, an accomplished scholar and an experienced educationist, has sought to do this in his recently published volume *A Modern Introduction to the New Testament*. Mr. Kendall has managed to include a great collection of knowledge in the 282 pages of his volume and this knowledge exhibits a high standard of accuracy and is well abreast of the most modern results. Some of these results are of a quite unexpected character. For example, what ordinary reader of the New Testament could ever imagine that St. Luke, the devoted companion and ardent admirer of St. Paul whom he presents to his readers in the second half of the *Acts of the Apostles* as the great missionary hero of the primitive Christian Church, could have held different theological views from those of the great Apostle to the Gentiles? Yet such is the case. St. Luke does not appear to have believed in what was the central truth of the Pauline Gospel, the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross (p. 36).

Another example of an unexpected result is secured by a comparative study of the words of the Institution of the Eucharist in *Mark, Matthew, Luke* and St. Paul. (St. John omits it.) The only phrase which all four accounts have in common is: *this is my body* (268 f.).

It is this fact combined with another fact, *viz.* that the name given to the Eucharist throughout the *Acts of the Apostles* (*cf.* also *Luke* xxiv.35) is the 'Breaking of the Bread,' which has prompted the suggestion that the original form of the Eucharist consisted only of the Breaking of the Bread and that possibly the Cup was added by St. Paul for the purpose of stressing the commemoration of the atoning blood of Jesus. On the other hand there is much to be said for the view that Jesus instituted the Breaking of the Bread in the earlier days of His ministry and Himself added the Cup at that last meal before His crucifixion.

In connection with New Testament sacramentalism it is of interest to observe that Mr. Kendall is unable to make up his mind whether the sacramental teaching of the Fourth Gospel is directed against materialistic and mechanistic sacramental beliefs or is intended to promote them. That it has promoted them there can be no doubt. Yet Bishop Westcott and many of the profoundest interpreters of the Fourth Gospel influenced not least by vi.63, are convinced that the sacramental teaching of this Gospel

* *A Modern Introduction to the New Testament.* By Guy Kendall. (Methuen. 7/6. 1938.)

is definitely opposed to a materialistic and superstitious sacramentalism.

Mr. Kendall holds that controversy as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel had been greatly increased by the theological or Christological issues involved if that Gospel be accepted as historic (p. 47). We are not sure that in expressing this view Mr. Kendall is not behind the most advanced critical opinion. The question is too large a one to deal with here. It is quite true that the Divine Nature of Jesus is much more stressed in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptists but then so also is the Divine Nature of those who by accepting Jesus as the Divine Son are themselves born from above. If the Fourth Gospel contains, as Mr. Kendall reminds his readers, the confession of St. Thomas: My Lord and my God, it also contains what Mr. Kendall does not refer to, the words of the Risen Saviour to Mary Magdalene: Go, tell my brethren that I ascend unto my Father and your Father: to my God and your God.

The great gulf between God and man which orthodox Christianity ought to have bridged but which it has really widened does not exist for the author of the Fourth Gospel.

In referring to the incidents of the withering of the barren fig tree and the finding of the coin in the fish's mouth, Mr. Kendall seems to regard both as incredible. There is nothing incredible, so it seems to us, in Mark's account of the withering of the fig tree. The incredibility is introduced by the word 'immediately' added by Matthew to his account. A quite natural interpretation of the story of the coin makes the incident a coincidence and not a miracle.

Mr. Kendall's volume is full of interest and like the effort of many of the best teachers, whilst providing a mass of information for its readers, it raises more questions than it answers. We do not know of any better book with which an ordinary layman could begin his study of the New Testament in a modern way.

H.D.A.M.

POPULAR PSYCHOLOGICAL FALLACIES*

When a science becomes a subject for popular discussion those who study it seriously suffer many annoyances. Popular writers often mis-state its relatively secure conclusions and treat as ascertained truth what are only probable or even improbable hypotheses. Mr. James G. Taylor, Senior Lecturer in Psychology in Cape Town University, has written a book out of his annoyance. *Popular Psychological Fallacies* is an exposure of the nonsense which popular authors and some serious psychologists write, as if it were scientific truth.

An author who gives such a title to his book should know how to be popular, and in his later chapters Mr. Taylor succeeds in being so. He dis-

* *Popular Psychological Fallacies.* By James G. Taylor. (Watts & Co. 1938. 7/6.)

cusses subjects in the public mind, the recent treason trials in Moscow, the theory that some races of mankind are superior to others, the causes of dictatorships, and others. He even gives two pages to explaining why some clergymen are atheists. His style is clear and concrete; he describes some important experiments and explains what may be learnt from them, while his conclusions come so pat and with such a show of reason that one feels compelled to agree with him.

But further thought shows that full agreement would be premature. Mr. Taylor is a Behaviourist.

> 'The law to which I make appeal is that all forms of conscious experience are the products of habitual modes of behaviour acquired during the lifetime of the individual. Accept that law, and at once conscious phenomena become intelligible. Reject it, and all is confusion.'

Again, 'Behaviour depends on social and economic forces.' And 'We do not act because we believe, but we believe because we act.'

According to this theory everything we do is dictated to us by the impressions we receive from the external world, while in the long run our actions determine our beliefs, although false ideas may for a time prevent us from realizing their true meanings. This is a simple and attractive theory, and, as the Insect Play now running in London reminds us, much of our thinking is simply the image of our instinctive reactions to our environment. We do not bother to think, but adapt ourselves to our environment by instinct like flies and beetles. But this does not explain the whole of human consciousness. For instance, it leaves the sense of right and wrong a mystery, since we sometimes choose a difficult and dangerous course because we think it right, when we know that another would be more in harmony with our surroundings, and therefore easier and more advantageous. According to Mr. Taylor, environment is everything and heredity nothing; but the present tendency of science is to regard heredity as more important than environment. Mr. Taylor is himself the victim of the scientist's fallacy that what cannot be examined and measured by science does not exist. It leads him to dismiss the hypothesis of the unconscious mind as preposterous, in spite of its extreme usefulness in explaining much of human behaviour.

Mr. Taylor would like to be rigidly scientific; but he does not always succeed. This explanation of drunkenness, for instance, is hardly scientific: A man is a drunkard 'because the structure of society has condemned him to a life of intolerable poverty and misery.'

To suggest, however, that such exaggerations are frequent would be to give a false impression of this book. Mr. Taylor's analyses of modern problems and events are shrewd and he is always readable. And if what he calls the psychoanalytic racket blinds him to the truths which psychoanalysis has revealed, it is the psychoanalysts themselves who have often been to blame. Perhaps his most valuable chapters are the opening ones, in which he describes the experiments by which psychologists explore our

senses and unveil the processes whereby as children we learn to use them. These chapters are not easy reading, but they tell one a lot that the average reader does not know. And they have an important bearing upon the theory of knowledge.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

SIGNPOSTS TO GOD*

When the history of the twentieth century comes to be written, the use —and misuse—of wireless broadcasting as an instrument of propaganda will take an important place among the various factors which even now are shaping its course. On all sides we see the virtual disappearance of that attitude of detachment and intellectual independence which is so essential to the mental health of nations as well as of individuals. In consequence the technique of mass suggestion is in a fair way to becoming one of the applied sciences. But if we can judge by the 'overwhelming number' of letters and questions received by the Dean of St. Paul's after his recent broadcast talks, in this country at any rate there is still a large number of people who are willing to listen to thoughtful argument even about religion, and able to think about it for themselves.

For this reason it is regrettable that the public is not given more opportunities for hearing popular and untechnical, but at the same time reasoned expositions of the Christian religion, such as is contained in Dr. Matthews' latest broadcast talks,* now rightly put into the more permanent form of print. The ground covered will be familiar to most readers of this notice, but the temper of the book is adequately conveyed by its title. Not so very long ago this would have been, not 'Signposts to God,' but 'Proofs of the Existence of God.' Dr. Matthews deals in simple but masterly fashion with such 'pointers' as Nature, History, Conscience, etc., and to the talks are appended a sermon preached in Exeter College, Oxford, on 'God as a Person' (in which he makes some penetrating criticisms of the vague, impersonal theism of Aldous Huxley's latest phase) and the substance of some newspaper articles.

This little book should do much to remove

> 'the depth of misunderstanding which prevails among Christian people about what Christianity teaches. I fear that the reason for this is partly that the sermons they have heard in church have rarely dealt with the foundation doctrines of the faith in an intelligible manner' (p. 85).

Few will disagree with this. But just for a brief moment one suspects that the author comes perilously near to transgressing in this way himself when he writes:

> 'No doubt the old doctrine of the consequences of the Fall of Adam cannot be accepted as it stands, but behind that allegory is a truth which we can only dimly apprehend. The whole creation needs redemp-

* *Signposts to God.* By the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 2/6. 1938.)

tion. For my part, I believe that the result of some wholly unimaginable "fall" in the unseen world was a partly "demonic" life-force, which is, indeed, overruled and guided by God, but not wholly in accord with His will' (p. 81).

We are indebted to Dr. Matthews for his personal attitude to the Fall-doctrine, but one feels that this statement, as it stands, can only serve to mystify the untheological reader whom the author has in mind.

With the exception of this trifling point, however, the matter contained in this book is admirably suited to its purpose, and we need much more 'religious propaganda' of this sort, both over the wireless and in print.

A. W. Adams.

A MOST READABLE LIFE OF ST. PAUL*

It is required in a volume of the Home University Library that its reader should be furnished in a lucid way with such of the available facts as can be given in a comparatively small compass. If at the same time the lucidity has a freshness accomplished by presenting the matter as if it had never been presented before, a real service is rendered both to the general public and to the student who values a scholarly summary. Professor Nock has achieved such a desirable volume in the Home University Library *St. Paul*. Before he approaches the large questions by his treatment of which St. Paul so deeply influenced the history of Christianity and of the world, he discharges faithfully the necessary task of describing the background of St. Paul's life and work. In this earlier part of the book, as in the rest, the author shows a robust sincerity which scorns even to try to draw any aids to orthodoxy or to piety out of, for example, his description of the use made by the earliest Christians and their contemporary Jews of the Old Testament, just as he avoids this error when dealing with a passage where, for example, St. Paul is describing the Second Coming. Prof. Nock is always content to explain what the meaning of the passage is without either making excuses for what now seems so crude or wheedling the reader's attention away from the crudity by the pious moralizing beloved by so many commentators. This sincerity makes for as great a clarity as the rather complicated subject of St. Paul, known through a critical examination of *Acts* and the *Epistles*, will allow.

St. Paul was a Jew, and the development of his thought is best understood by tracing it from Jewish roots. To take one example, the dualism of Spirit *versus* Flesh may appear to be Hellenistic, but

> 'Paul himself could be strictly dualist, for he believed that a glorified body would be the mode of the risen life of the Elect.'

This is clearly worked out (pp. 166-7).

Among the many other important points necessarily dealt with, it is well to select in order to be reasonably brief in indicating the type of treatment

* *St. Paul*. By Arthur Darby Nock, Frothingham Professor of the History of Religion in Harvard University. Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., Home University Library. 2/6. 1938.

given in this book; but before sketching Prof. Nock's treatment of the conversion, the meaning of 'life in Christ,' and of St. Paul's teaching on the Eucharist, it is necessary to explain that he depends chiefly on the earlier *Epistles* for his evidence, inclining to distrust the *Acts* except in the 'we-passages.'

Accordingly, the presence of St. Paul at the death of Stephen is questioned; but his conversion was probably begun by the teaching of Stephen as it was disseminated in the time of the subsequent persecution, and was a more gradual process than St. Paul himself realised. Nevertheless,

> 'there was before his conversion a sharp antithesis between loyalty to Judaism on the one hand and the Christian movement on the other. His conversion happened as a drastic psychological crisis, which he does not and could not explain, and which we cannot explain either' (pp. 67-8).

On the meaning of being 'in Christ' Prof. Nock writes:

> 'We might have supposed that the Pauline theory whereby the believer received the Spirit and is "in Christ," would involve the notion that the believer is exempt from the moral struggle. Some of Paul's converts seem, in fact, to have thought so. Nevertheless, his moral exhortations are not simply an abandonment of theory in favour of common sense. He held that the moral imperative was implicit in predestination or election, and that it might be obeyed or not. He was not absolutely certain even of his own future bliss (I *Cor.* ix, 27); if righteousness can be called a possession it is also a hope (*Gal.* v, 5) . . .
>
> 'Freedom from sin was a given freedom from something which was, so to speak, objective and not subjective; freedom to live in the Spirit and in devotion to the beloved community' (pp. 157-8).

St. Paul's teaching about 'justification' is to be interpreted in accordance with this moral view of being 'in Christ'; for from a study of *Galatians* we understand that,

> 'through the death of Jesus, God had given both pardon and the power to live a life which should need no pardon' (p. 163).

This, in brief, is the view taken in this book of this conviction of St. Paul's, a conviction which is his most characteristic and most influential contribution to the development of Christianity, coming as it does from the heart of his own experience.

Space does not permit of an adequate reference to the account of St. Paul's teaching on the Eucharist. It may be indicated by saying that according to this account the aspect of the Eucharist which speaks of the elements as spiritual food is not developed in St. Paul as it is in the Fourth Gospel. Participation in the body and blood means, not taking the body and blood of Christ into the bodies of those present, but, with the Last Supper and future 'table-fellowship' with the Messiah in mind,

> 'that they participate in his body (which probably means his glorified body of the Resurrection, but would naturally suggest also the other sense of "body of Christ"), and they participate in his blood whereby his life was offered to God' (p. 189).

For the lay mind this section might have been clearer if the sense of 'the body of Christ' as the Church had been briefly explained and the short critical analysis of the reports of the Words of Institution placed earlier. The reader would then be better able to grasp what must be a rather novel conclusion to many, that, as St. Paul understood it, the *primary* connection of the Eucharist was with the Last Supper as a communal meal and not as itself a designedly anticipatory presentation of the Cross. But any criticism of this book must be swallowed up in admiration of a work of only 247 pages, which is usually extremely clear, always vigorous and informative, giving a fresh, concise view of St. Paul without suggesting anything startlingly new for which adequate reason cannot be given.

A. R. C. Leaney.

ISRAEL: ANCIENT AND MODERN*

It is no small achievement to have presented, within the limits of a volume about as big as an 8/6 novel, 'a coherent and intelligible idea (as the publishers' just and temperate foreword puts it) of Jewish origins and progress through the ages.' Three thousand five hundred years of Jewish history in 426 pages. And the record is not only coherent and intelligible. It is also consistently interesting; which—when we recollect early flounderings in 'Old Testament History'—should earn our gratitude.

The difficult art of compression was not least amongst the qualities necessary to the task; a fact sufficiently suggested in the mere titles of the five Books into which the work is divided—Book I, *e.g. Israel*: 1600-586 B.C.,or Book III, *Diaspora*: 425-1492. The mass of intricate material—itself a formidable enough Diaspora for any historian's handling—looming behind the clarity and order of these thirty chapters must be immense.

It becomes early apparent that Mr. Roth is as completely abreast of modern scholarship and critical method as he is on just occasion able to take independent lines of his own. On the question, *e.g.* of the historicity of Moses he concludes that the traditional story is, in broad outline at least, true; the existence of such a figure, even were no records extant, being deducible from the whole history and development of the Hebrew people. Equally sane appears his verdict on the Biblical story of the Return from Babylon 'which modern critical opinion completely discredits.' He pronounces again in favour of tradition because 'in an Oriental country of retentive memory . . . it hardly seems likely that in the brief intervening period (before the books of Ezra and Nehemiah were written) a major falsification or misconception of outstanding events in recent history could have taken place.'

Perhaps the reader's next observation may be that this is, very definitely,

* *A Short History of the Jewish People.* 1600 B.C.—A.D. 1935. By Cecil Roth. (Macmillan. 1936. 18/-.)

history written by one who is a Jew and not a Christian. This note, first sounded in the author's preface, is thrown into startling relief in the treatment of a Figure who, to a large section of the human race, must be central in any such context. Apart from passing allusions, there are only two passages of specific reference to Jesus of Nazareth. In the first, a matter of four or five lines (p. 98) we have '. . . a religious revivalist from Galilee named Joshua (Jesus) who laid claim to Davidic descent, was crucified on Passover eve, after a summary trial, by the nervous administration.' Further on (pp. 140-141) we have another passage consisting of a page and a quarter on 'Joshua, or Jesus of Nazareth—a Galilean religious reformer and preacher. . . .' 'His doctrines were not perhaps conspicuously original.' He attracted opposition from the Romans 'whose rule was threatened by his political aspirations. . . .' (Surely a doubtful statement.) 'When he perished upon the Cross . . . it was to be imagined that his influence would have died with him, as was the case with so many of his contemporaries. However, his personal magnetism must have been extreme. . . .'

Such writing, reflecting, perhaps, an understandable reaction to centuries of Christian persecution, must, it is to be feared, alienate numbers of potential readers. Apart from which the historical perspective must appear in serious defect. Juster and more generous are other references recently, as it happens, before the eyes of the present reviewer: Lord Shaw's in 'The Trial of Jesus Christ'—'the greatest son of one of the greatest races of mankind'; and Mr. Lionel Curtis' in 'Civitas Dei' (Vol. III, p. 24)

> 'From the records we have I believe that Jesus Christ was . . . wholly divine and not less divine because he was human. When such a man had lived and died . . . creation had passed to a higher plane . . . a new chapter in its (the human race's) history was opened. . . .'

If Jesus is one of the 'aspects and characters' spoken of by Mr. Roth in his preface as 'overstressed in the traditional tale of woe' and in this work 'relegated to the background' many minds—and not only those committed to the Christian faith—will find the adjustment altogether beyond their acceptance.

The sustained interest of theme and treatment will, nevertheless, reward those who continue beyond such shocks. The dry bones of history are constantly vitalised with the breath of significant and illuminating comment. Of Titus' destruction of Jerusalem it is observed that

> 'The profoundest outcome of the apparent disaster was that it forced Judaism to exist—the first of the world's great religions to do so—without sacrificial worship.'

Of Constantine's Edict of Toleration in 313 that it marked

> 'the end of the classical period in the realm of ideas, and in that sense . . . the real point of division between ancient and modern times.'

Of the Talmud

'it made the whole people of Israel one . . . it gave them a fatherland.'

Notable perhaps amongst many things precluded from notice in a short review are the chapters 'The Triumph of Christianity,' 'The Shadow of the Cross,' 'The Social Revolution,' 'Life in the Ghetto'; whilst of particular interest at the present time are the account of the premature attempt in the sixteenth century to re-establish the Jews in Palestine; of the immense advance of Jewry in numbers (from two and a half million in 1800 to sixteen million in 1935) and achievement—a truly remarkable record—in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; of the development of anti-Semitism, especially in Germany 'the classical land of Jewish martyrdom . . . the frontiers of barbarism were thrust forward at a stroke from the Vistula to the Rhine. . . .'

Mr. Roth writes in clear and attractive style. There are four good maps. As one lays down this accomplished Odyssey of wandering, seeking, suffering, achievement, there come into one's mind words with which the great epic introduces its hero 'who wandered far and wide . . . and many were the men whose towns he saw and whose mind he learnt, yea and many the woes he suffered . . . striving to win his own life and the return of his company.'

D. G. Davies.

THE FOURTH EVANGELIST IDENTIFIED?*

Many who saw the correspondence in the *Times* in February, 1936, occasioned by the report of Dr. Eisler's lecture on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, will approach this volume with the expectation of satisfying in the light of further evidence the curiosity then aroused; while those who know Dr. Eisler's other books, particularly *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist,* will expect to find the same combination of amazing erudition and suggestiveness with a certain arbitrariness and dogmatism which is characteristic of his writing.

This book should prove more acceptable to Christians than most of his earlier volumes, but in many ways it is true to type: it builds up on the foundations of new discoveries and the rediscovery of forgotten texts, and of the conjectures of many scholars whose very names will be unknown to most readers, and above all of Dr. Eisler himself, a hypothesis which is on the whole coherent, plausible, and yet revolutionary.

Before summarizing this hypothesis, it may be well to indicate what the most important of these foundations is. It is the realization by Dom de Bruyne (as followed by Harnack, Lietzmann, and other first-class authorities) that the so-called *Anti-Marcionite Prologues* found in several old Latin manuscripts of the Gospels are not, as used to be assumed, of a late date,

* *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel.* By Robert Eisler. (Methuen. 12/6. 1938.)

but go back to Papias early in the second century, and are in fact the earliest external evidence of the authorship of the Gospels which we possess. Dr. Eisler conjectures that they were written in their present form in A.D. 313 by Fortunatian (who afterwards became Bishop of Aquileia) at a time when new copies of the Bible were needed to replace those which had been destroyed under the edict of Diocletian.

Unfortunately the text of the Johannine Prologue is slightly corrupt. Some small emendation is needed to make sense of the most important passage, which runs thus:

> *. . . descripsit vero evangelium dictante Iohanne recte. Verum Marcion haereticus cum ab eo fuisset improbatus eo quod contraria sentiebat abiectus est ab Iohanne. Is vero scripta uel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.*

As the text stands, there is no subject to the verb *descripsit*: Dr. Eisler has found that the text was punctuated in the sixth century by a presbyter of Ravenna called Patricius, whose Archbishop had presumably given instructions that the inacceptable statement that Marcion had had a hand in the composition of the Fourth Gospel must be suppressed. Thus the stop which Patricius cunningly inserted before '*verum Marcion haereticus*' should be placed after it, making Marcion the subject of '*descripsit.*' The meaning will then be that Marcion wrote down a true (= '*verum*') Gospel at the dictation of John: and that later, 'having been disapproved by him for holding contrary views, he was expelled by John. He had, however, brought him writings, or letters, from the brethren who were in Pontus' (p. 156). And our author sees traces of Marcionism in the Gospel, in contrast to the strongly anti-Marcionite tone of the Johannine Epistles, which suggest that the Evangelist did not wholly succeed in eradicating the heretical tendencies which Marcion had inserted before he was found out.

In support of this rendering Dr. Eisler prints some mediaeval miniatures which do indeed show the Evangelist dictating to a scribe, but do not prove any more than that our text ('*dictante Iohanne*') was known in *some* form to the artists. But his interpretation does indeed give a good sense to the Latin, though the juxtaposition of the words *recte* and *verum* does not say much for the writer's sense of style, and we may suspect a deeper corruption. Possibly, as Mr. Guy Kendall has suggested, the word *verum* should be put after *haereticus*, and mean 'but': this would imply that the evangelist dictated correctly but not that what Marcion wrote down was true. This fits Dr. Eisler's theory better than his own text.

The *scripta uel epistulas* which Marcion had brought from Pontus, Dr. Eisler takes to be sources of the Gospel originally written by 'the beloved disciple' and now used by the evangelist. But the latter had also been present at the crucifixion, though not as a disciple, for he was John the son of Annas (mentioned as a judge of Peter and the son of Zebedee in

Acts iv, 6), taken to see the execution by his father 'in order to be impressed at an early age by the terrible fate overtaking the evil-doer.' He had been attracted by Jesus, and had been the little child whom He set in the midst of His disciples as an example of humility, and also (according to St. Ambrose, etc.) the young man who fled away naked at the arrest. But he did not become a Christian until after his disillusionment about Judaism at the fall of Jerusalem, before which he had been High-priest, A.D. 37-41, and even an army-commander (!) in the wars of A.D. 66-70, when the Zealots had swept up even the Sadducees into their rebellious ranks. It was in connection with this that the Romans suspected him after the Jewish rebellions in A.D. 115, and he was martyred at Ephesus in his extreme old age.

The 'beloved disciple' is identified not only, as by Swete, with the rich young ruler of the Synoptists (*Mk.* x, 21), but also, as by Rudolf Steiner and the Rev. W. K. Fleming, with Lazarus (*cf. Jn.* xi, 3, p. 190*f.*). This is of course conjectural, and there might well have been others besides these two whom Jesus specially loved. But Dr. Eisler seems to be right in maintaining that the beloved disciple was neither the son of Zebedee, whose own mother is said to have been present at the crucifixion (*Mt.* xxvii, 56), nor the Evangelist—the young priest, who was also present at the crucifixion and can himself guarantee that the testimony of the beloved disciple is true. *Cf. Jn.* xix, 35: 'he (= *hahu gabra,* the Aramaic idiom for 'I') knoweth that he saith true': and *Jn.* xxi, 24, 'we know that his testimony is true,' where the 'we' is taken to be editorial.

This view of the authorship is far more 'conservative' than that of, for instance, the late Dr. Streeter: and the contention that the evangelist was of the high-priestly family fits admirably the statement of the Ephesian bishop Polycrates, who applies the term Apostle to Philip, but of the Ephesian John says instead that he had worn the priestly gold frontlet—which could never have been done by a Galilean fisherman. Dr. Eisler emphasizes the fact, which is often overlooked, that the only second-century document which identifies even the beloved disciple with the son of Zebedee is the Apocryphal (Leucian) *Acts of John,* which is deeply tainted with the morbid ascetism of the Gnostics and initiated the legend of the effeminate young celibate who has been hallowed by traditional Catholicism: whereas not even Irenaeus, that great protagonist of the apostolic succession, who twice mentions the son of Zebedee, ever speaks of the Fourth Evangelist as anything more than the *disciple* of the Lord. Dr. Eisler produces fresh evidence in support of the view that the son of Zebedee was martyred along with his brother James in A.D. 42: and this seems most probable, except for the mention of John as a pillar of the church in the second visit to Jerusalem described in *Galatians,* which must have been later than 42. This difficulty is not insuperable, for it may well have been

another John as well as James mentioned in *Galatians*: but we are far from happy about Dr. Eisler's solution in re-arranging the order of events described in *Acts*, making even the Council of Jerusalem come before the death of James—and John. This treatment is surely too arbitrary, even in the case of the early chapters of *Acts*, before the 'we-passages' begin.

There are several other conjectures as to dates and details which fly in the face of the generally accepted opinions of the higher critics. Thus, as against Dr. Charles, we are assured that the Apocalypse is the work of not merely one but two pseudonymous authors, one of them with a distinctly gnostic bias: and the crucifixion is dated much earlier than is usual. Moreover the author will not exactly ingratiate himself with English readers by his tendency to put forward his conjectures as established facts. An interesting sidelight on this characteristic is presented by his comments on a passage of Eusebius, who is using the word 'clearly' of a statement which is probably false. Dr. Eisler writes:

> 'Authors who say 'clearly,' 'obviously,' 'evidently,' 'surely,' say so—and this general principle applies with full force to the present writer and the present sentence—because they want to emphasize their own conviction in the face of the contradiction which they know their statement is sure to provoke.'

We feel that many of Dr. Eisler's readers will be critical of his frequent use of the word 'clearly' in the same way as he is of Eusebius'. But if they make a practice of mentally substituting for it some such word as 'presumably,' they will be the more able perhaps to see in this network of erudite hypothesis, amid much that is insecurely established, certain suggestions which, although they do not completely solve the enigma, at least are a real contribution towards its solution. We could wish that our author might curb his enthusiasm for his more precarious speculations and give us more references where he is treading on firmer ground.

H. P. Kingdon.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

Sir,

THE NEED FOR A MODERN CRUSADE.

Like many others, I was very glad to see Mr. Horan's article on 'A Modern Crusade.' It is just what so many of us have been feeling for a long time, and I cannot help thinking that the time has come when the M.C.U. should come right out into the open and proclaim its principles so that they reach the public outside its own body, and who may not even be aware of its existence. The Loughborough Conference gives an opportunity for plain speaking; but, even so, that would only reach a modicum of people compared with the vast masses who are entirely indifferent to religion. The greater publicity I am thinking of can be obtained by making a definite stand against some of the statements in the Creeds about which Churchmen are divided—one to wit, the Virgin Birth, which to many God-

fearing people is quite unacceptable. There are other cracks in the foundations of belief which need the light of present-day knowledge to strengthen them before they crumble away.

Of course this would mean bitter opposition. Christ knew that quite well when He started His great crusade, and so it will be now even though it is the Truth that is being sought after. It is noteworthy that 6,338 clergymen in the Province of Canterbury have signed a petition against the Report of the Doctrinal Commission. Are these 6,338 clergymen not aware that what they ask 'your Venerable Houses to declare,' *viz.* 'that the doctrine set forth in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles remains the authoritative teaching of the Church of England,' and 'that the Church of England holds and teaches the Nicene Creed *in that sense only in which it has ever been held throughout the history of the Church* (italics mine), they are keeping thousands of people, especially young people, outside the Church and allowing them to become indifferent to religion altogether? How many of us can conscientiously repeat the whole of the Nicene Creed? One would think that it was like the laws of the Medes and Persians, which alter not, instead of being capable of modification as fresh truth filters through the mist.

Let us then be up and doing, not fearing the odium that is bound to be showered upon us, but striving, as Mr. Horan says, 'to present the glorious figure of the Gospels without the ecclesiastical trappings that have so long obscured it.'

J. Wheeler Williams.

AN ATTACK ON VON HÜGEL.

Sir,

Mr. Handley exaggerates, because he does not 'know the ropes' as he would do if he were a Roman Catholic. To say that von Hügel was very discreet in public and, being human, let himself go in private, is only to say of him what would be said of most of his eminent co-religionists, who were all writhing under the tyranny of the Curia. If you are ruled by a sort of Red Queen who can cry 'Off with his head' at any moment she likes, you are to be excused what otherwise might be termed 'double-faced and false.' But, owing to the Modernist crisis, the Baron found himself in a hole, and there were many who felt that he assisted his escape from that hole by planting one foot in the centre of Tyrrell's back.

No English person, schoolboy or otherwise, forgives or forgets that sort of thing, especially where both were comrades in arms. Although the difference between the Modernism of Tyrrell and that of Loisy was serious, yet after Loisy was condemned by the Roman Curia, Tyrrell would have died rather than call public attention to the difference between Loisy and himself. The point in dispute touches 'the chastity of honour,' to use Edmund Burke's phrase.

I quite agree that the Baron was a saintly man and in no ordinary sense of the word a coward. I can see him standing up to Nero & Co. unflinchingly and winning the martyr's crown. But excommunication, even unjust, brings with it the scandal and reprobation of the people of God—of the good—no martyr's crown—only discredit and loss of all power to do good, apparently for as long as life lasts. *That* was what Tyrrell felt so keenly and that the Baron could not face. 'With the wicked was he reckoned' was said of Christ and it is the greatest moral suffering this life can bring to any of His followers.

K. M. Clutton.

26 Matlock Court, W.11.

FRIENDS OF REUNION.

SIR,

The Friends of Reunion are anxious to get into touch with all Ministers' Fraternals (denominational or otherwise) in England. May I, therefore, through your columns, invite secretaries of Fraternals to send me simply a postcard containing their name and address, together with the name of the Fraternal? We should be most grateful for such information.

Annandale, North End Road,
London, N.W.11.

T. H. H. KILBORN,
Secretary.

CHARGES OF HERESY.

SIR,

Were one to say in the public press that a solicitor was the spiritual son of Messrs. Dodson and Fogg, or that a chemist was unable to distinguish between epsom salts and oxalic acid, or to suggest that a woman was lacking in virtue, or a soldier in courage, one would be mulcted in all probability in heavy damages. Apparently, however, one may bring the most serious charge of heresy against a clergyman with complete immunity. In two consecutive sentences of a letter in a recent issue of a widely-read Church weekly appear the words 'heretical,' 'heretic' and 'heresy.'

What is a heretic? A heretic is a person who promulgates doctrinal views which have been formally and explicitly declared inconsistent with the tenets of the particular church to which he or she belongs. The Roman Church has an efficient—a very efficient—machine to deal with such persons. The Free Churches have their methods. In the Church of England the competent authority is vested in the Courts of the land, and in the last resort, in that august group of 'elderly lawyers whose attitude towards ecclesiastical disputes is one of slightly cynical impartiality.' This tribunal is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, for whom, as an ex-lawyer, I have the greatest respect. In 1871 this Court decided that certain views held by Mr. Voysey were heretical. They are therefore heretical still. No pronouncements have, however, been made on many questions which are the subjects of acute controversy to-day. Therefore none of the divergent views are heretical.

It would, I venture to suggest, tend to greater peace in our Zion if clergymen would manfully resist the *cacoethes scribendi,* and instead of rushing into print to dub a brother cleric a heretic would take to heart the sound advice of the Town Clerk of Ephesus—*ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται.*

Oxford.

A. M. COLEMAN.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

SIR,

The omission of the final 's' from the word 'sins' in the *Gloria in Excelsis* would make it a more exact copy of the word attributed to John the Baptist, 'Behold, the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world,' and tend to release the mind from wrong explanations of the Atonement.

WILLIAM WESTELL.

Ottawa, Canada.